

Sociology and Social . . . Research . . .

AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL

Sociology of Charles S. Johnson 243
PRESTON VALIEN

Sociology and International Relations . . . 249
FRED A. SONDERMANN

Social Class and Stereotyping 256
THOMAS E. LASSWELL

Schizoid Culture and Sociopathy 263
READ BAIN

Theory of Social Stratification 269
ROBERT A. ELLIS

Attitudes Toward Dating 274
PANOS D. BARDIS

Children's Conceptions of Stratification . . 278
EUGENE A. WEINSTEIN

Mukerjee and Social Values 285
EMORY S. BOGARDUS

Pacific Sociological News 297

Social Problems and Welfare 298
Peoples and Culture . . . 303

Social Theory and Research 307
Other Publications Received 313

VOL. 42
YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, \$3.50

MARCH-APRIL 1958

No. 4
SINGLE COPIES, 70 CENTS

Sociology and Social Research

AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL

PUBLISHED BIMONTHLY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
UNIVERSITY PARK, LOS ANGELES 7, CALIFORNIA

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, \$3.50

SINGLE COPIES, 70¢

Entered as second-class matter March 31, 1936, at the post office at Los Angeles, California, under the act of March 3, 1879.

Editor

Emory S. Bogardus

Managing Editor

Martin H. Neumeyer

News Notes Editor

Edward C. McDonagh

Associate Editors

Harvey J. Locke

George B. Mangold

Bessie A. McClenahan

John E. Nordskog

James A. Peterson

Georges Sabagh

Maurice D. Van Arsdol, Jr.

Melvin J. Vincent

University of
Southern California

Advisory Editors

| | |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Jessie Bernard | Pennsylvania State University |
| Herbert Blumer | University of California |
| Leonard Broom | University of California, Los Angeles |
| Ernest W. Burgess | University of Chicago |
| F. Stuart Chapin | University of Minnesota |
| George M. Day | Occidental College |
| John L. Gillin | University of Wisconsin |
| A. B. Hollingshead | Yale University |
| Katherine Jocher | University of North Carolina |
| William Kirk | Pomona College |
| Paul H. Landis | State College of Washington |
| Andrew W. Lind | University of Hawaii, Hawaii |
| George A. Lundberg | University of Washington |
| Radhakamal Mukerjee | Lucknow University, India |
| Meyer F. Nimkoff | Florida State University |
| Pitirim A. Sorokin | Harvard University |
| Leopold von Wiese | University of Cologne |
| Kimball Young | Northwestern University |
| Florian Znaniecki | University of Illinois |

Contributed materials which appear in *Sociology and Social Research* do not necessarily express the opinion or the policy of the editorial staff and publisher.

Articles published in this journal are indexed in *The International Index to Periodicals*, and abstracted in *Sociological Abstracts* and *Psychological Abstracts*.

PUBLISHED BY

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA PRESS
UNIVERSITY PARK LOS ANGELES 7, CALIFORNIA

SOCIOLOGY AND SOCIAL RESEARCH

March-April 1958



SOCIOLOGICAL CONTRIBUTIONS OF CHARLES S. JOHNSON

PRESTON VALIEN

Fisk University

The sociological contributions of Charles S. Johnson reflect his unusual training, brilliant insights, practical wisdom, and seemingly inexhaustible energies. He was a prodigious worker and a prolific writer; at the time of his inauguration as President of Fisk University in 1947, a bibliography of his works compiled by the Fisk University library listed seventeen books of which he was author or coauthor, fourteen other books to which he had contributed chapters, plus more than threescore articles. After his inauguration he still continued his writing, but his purely sociological work diminished as his writings reflected more the effective application of the principles and methods of the social sciences to the broad field of educational policy and administration. It should be noted, however, that his varied talents as editor, philanthropic foundation official and adviser, college president and educational statesman were all rooted in a broad background of social science knowledge and techniques, much of which he contributed or developed himself as a pioneer social scientist in the area of human relations.

Charles Johnson's training as a sociologist was gained principally through an unusual apprenticeship relationship which he formed at the University of Chicago under the guidance of Robert E. Park. At Chicago he developed an association with Park, beginning in 1917, which was to continue and grow until Park's death at Fisk University in 1944. From Park and other members of the distinguished sociology faculty at Chicago, Johnson obtained a broad background of sociological theory related to the principles of social interaction and collective behavior and to the problems of racial and cultural contacts not only in the United States but from the perspective of comparative cultures with a focus on all the major racial frontiers of the world. Park, W. I. Thomas, and Ellsworth Faris were

seeking to understand the phenomena of race from a broader perspective than the context of American societal experiences, and Johnson was one of the fortunate beneficiaries of their stimulating studies and analyses as they sought to bring the problems of race within the focus of sociological study.

In view of the nature of his training at Chicago, it is not surprising that one of the major sociological contributions of Charles S. Johnson was his demonstration that the highly emotional area of race relations could be studied by sociologists from an objective and scientific point of view. His first major research undertaking in this field resulted in the classic work *The Negro in Chicago: A Study of Race Relations and a Race Riot* (1922). While this volume was a joint effort of the staff of the Chicago Commission on Race Relations of which Johnson was the associate director, it has all the characteristics which were to distinguish much of his subsequent work in this field. It utilized a concrete situation not merely for purposes of description but as a means of obtaining a wider understanding of human behavior. It combined the effective use of personal documents and statistical data and documented in an objective fashion not only the riot itself but also the events leading up to it as well as the misconceptions, misinformation, and attitudes upon which the events were based.

Although Johnson was not a textbook writer, one of his major sociological contributions was also in this area. Just as one of his teachers' books, the notable *Introduction to the Science of Sociology* (1921) by Park and Burgess, was to become one of the most influential textbooks in sociological history, so was one of Johnson's books to occupy a similar place in the field of race relations. It is worth noting, parenthetically, that race prejudice and racial contacts are dealt with at length in the *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*, a book which he, like other Chicago students, regarded as the Bible of sociology for many years. Johnson's book *The Negro in American Civilization* (1930) became for a period the most commonly used textbook in American sociology classes on race relations. The book was the result of two years of planning for the National Interracial Conference, which was held in 1928 under the sponsorship of sixteen national organizations interested in improving race relations in this country. After the Conference, Johnson, who was Director of Research for the National Urban League and who served as research secretary for the Conference, was designated to organize into book form the materials which had been prepared for the

Conference. The result was *The Negro in American Civilization*, which brought together for the first time in a systematic manner the findings of social research with respect to race relations and the status of the Negro in American life. This book was followed in 1934 by *Race Relations*, a textbook written in collaboration with W. D. Weatherford. It succeeded *The Negro in American Civilization* as a basic text in race relations.

Johnson became chairman of the Department of Social Sciences at Fisk University in 1928, and it was from this position that he made his most substantial sociological contributions while at the same time rendering important services to the American government, philanthropic foundations, and social agencies. Some of these services resulted in reports of great sociological significance, such as his service in 1930 as the American member of an International Commission of the League of Nations to inquire into the existence of slavery and forced labor in Liberia, his report on Negro Housing prepared in connection with President Hoover's Conference on Home Building and Home Ownership, a report on the Economic Status of the Negro prepared in 1933 for the Julius Rosenwald Fund, the report on Farm Tenancy prepared in 1937 for President Roosevelt's committee on Farm Tenancy, and a report as a member of an American Commission of twenty educators appointed by President Truman in 1946 to advise on the reorganization of the Japanese educational system.

The sociological studies of Charles Johnson covered a wide range of Negro life, but they were invariably oriented toward revealing the comparative status of the Negro within American society and the implications of this status for Negro personality development and for the nation's image of itself as a democratic society. In a telling statement on the latter point he said in *Patterns of Negro Segregation* (1943), "In one way or another, minorities are excluded from full participation in the life of the community and the conduct of the state. This immediately raises the question of the relation of this circumstance to the democratic theory of the state, which assumes complete participation of all who are capable of functioning economically or politically as members of society. The essential fact is that the actual practices of the dominant majority are, for whatever reason, in direct conflict with the ideals and professed objectives of the state. It is this fact that gives reality to the minority status of the Negro and other groups. It is the necessity for struggle that

forces upon them the solidarity by which alone they can gain the status that is assured them."

Johnson reflected the influence of his training under Park and George Herbert Mead in his consistent attempts to relate the personality development of Negroes to the influences of cultural background and social environment, and he had no peer in the empirical documentation of reactions of Negroes of varying socioeconomic classes to their racial status. In *The Shadow of the Plantation* (1934) he related the social and cultural influences of the plantation to the social patterns and personality development of Negroes within this type of agricultural situation; in *The Negro College Graduate* (1938) he attempted to synthesize the social as well as the educational philosophy of the Negro college graduate. In *Growing Up in the Black Belt* (1941), which was prepared for the American Youth Commission, he and his associates utilized case study methods in combination with a battery of statistical tests, many of which they developed themselves, to describe the effects of racial status upon the personality development of southern rural Negro youth. Much of his work involved an attempt to delineate the class structure of the Negro community and to describe the differential behavioral responses of the various classes. Systematic attempts to do this were made in *Growing Up in the Black Belt* and in *Patterns of Negro Segregation*. His concept of "the folk Negro" as a social category which cut across class lines was a new approach, as was his critical view of the caste theory of race relations. In *Growing Up in the Black Belt* Johnson took issue with the then current view of some social scientists who described race relations in America as a caste system. Johnson stated that the southern racial system differed from a caste system in that it lacked both religious sanctions and mutual acceptance of a fixed status. He pointed out that, unlike a caste system, the southern race system was highly unstable and that Negroes were constantly struggling against their racial status, while whites were constantly changing and redefining their own status in relation to Negroes.

In the area of research methodology, Johnson not only made effective use of human documents and the case study method in which Park was greatly interested, but he usually combined them with the skillful use of statistical methods and data. *The Statistical Atlas of Southern Counties* (1941), a listing and analysis of social and economic data for 1,104 counties, was one of his few major works in which he did not incorporate human document materials. Johnson also made a contribution of no small

magnitude to the personal document method by making available to other social scientists in mimeographed form at a nominal cost five Social Science Source Documents containing much of the personal interview materials which were collected in various studies at Fisk University but which were not included in the published results. These were issued under the following titles: (1) *Unwritten History of Slavery*, (2) *God Struck Me Dead*, (3) *Racial Attitudes*, (4) *Orientalism and Their Cultural Adjustment*, and (5) *The Social World of Negro Youth*.

The cataloging of Johnson's sociological contributions would be incomplete without some reference to his unusual ability to marshal facts effectively for practical application in the solution of concrete problems. One of his most influential contributions in this regard was his development of the "community self-survey of race relations." This was a technique for involving the people of a community in the self-discovery of facts regarding human relations in their own community. His first effort in this direction was published in 1944 under the title of *The Negro War Worker in San Francisco*. This technique was employed subsequently by other agencies and extended to other fields, notably the health field. Other contributions in this same context included two books, *To Stem This Tide: A Survey of Racial Tension Areas in the United States* (1943) and *Into the Main Stream: A Survey of Best Practices in Race Relations in the South* (1947), and a report prepared in 1942 for the state of Louisiana on the Negro public schools of Louisiana. From 1943 until 1948 he edited *The Monthly Summary of Events and Trends in Race Relations* and prepared an interpretative account of each month's events. This publication evolved initially from a confidential assignment from President Franklin D. Roosevelt for a monthly report on race relations which was later expanded and made available to social scientists and the general public. More recently, Johnson served as one of the social science consultants to the legal staff of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People during the preparation of the cases upon which the United States Supreme Court's historic school desegregation decisions of May 1954 and 1955 were rendered. Ernest W. Burgess, one of his former teachers at the University of Chicago, summarized Johnson's sociological contributions in an article in *Phylon* in 1956 in the following words: "In the process of change in race relations in the United States, from the race riot of Chicago to the Supreme Court's decision outlawing segregation in schools and requiring integration, no one has made a greater contribution than Charles S. Johnson."

The accumulated impact of his research has been tremendous because of his scientific objectivity, his caution in interpreting data, his understanding of the human element in social situations, and his discernment in coming to sound and practical application of his findings. He achieved first rank as a social scientist. He also developed as a great educator and as a social statesman to whom our government, our welfare, educational and religious organizations and UNESCO frequently turned for counsel and guidance." It would be difficult to formulate in so few words a better summary of the substantial sociological contributions of Charles S. Johnson.

SOCIOLOGY AND THE STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS*

FRED A. SONDERMANN

Colorado College

This study, written from the point of view of a student of international relations, seeks to describe existing and potential relationships between sociology and the evolving discipline of international relations. Special emphasis is placed on the links between the two fields which have already been established, on the problems confronting the international relations specialist who seeks to add concepts and data from sociology to those of his own field, and on the benefits which sociologists may derive from a greater concern with the study of international relations.

Specialists in the relatively young field of international relations, after a period of eclecticism with regard to subject matter and coverage, are just now beginning to demonstrate serious concern with the need for selecting and organizing materials on the basis of explicit unifying concepts and theories.¹ Previous emphasis on historical evidence, legal formulae, and structural description is giving way to more sophisticated analyses. The discipline of international relations involves the study of goal-directed action on the part of given participants operating in a specific field. The environment in which international relationships take place is characterized by weakness or absence of those factors which contribute to peaceful resolution of conflicts among individuals and groups in other environments (for example, within nations).

That many of the problems studied in international relations are amenable to sociological analysis can be demonstrated by listing some of the key questions asked by specialists in the field:

* The study resulting in this essay was made under an International Relations Training Fellowship grant by the Ford Foundation. The conclusions, opinions, and other statements are, of course, those of the author and not necessarily those of the Ford Foundation.

¹ See, for example, Hans J. Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, 2nd ed. (New York: A. A. Knopf Co., 1954); Charles O. Lerche, Jr., *Principles of International Politics* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1956); Vernon Van Dyke, *International Politics* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1957); and Ernst B. Haas and Allen S. Whiting, *Dynamics of International Relations* (New York, Toronto, London: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1956).

1. Who, precisely, are the participants in international relations? Are they states, governments, groups, or individuals? What are the relationships between individuals, subgroups, and the state in the formulation and execution of policies?

2. What are the goals of the participants? How are such goals selected?

3. What methods are used to achieve given goals, and what methods are chosen under given circumstances? To what extent does capacity to use given methods affect behavior? ("Capacity" is broadly interpreted as including not only tangible factors such as population, geography, resources, military power, but also such aspects of a society as its social organization, the degree of cohesion among individuals and groups, opinions and opinion-molding media, morale, and ideologies.)

4. To what types of interaction processes does the simultaneous pursuit of conflicting or complementary objectives by numerous participants give rise?

These questions, it is submitted, closely resemble those which sociologists commonly ask about groups which they study; and this identity of interest is the key to the relationship between the disciplines.

The assumptions of sociology which relate to international relations have been summarized² in terms of the group context of human existence, behavior, and tradition; the dynamism of institutions; the role of out-groups in the maintenance of in-groups and the integration of super-groups; and the impact of modern inventions on the pursuit of conflict and on the acceleration of social change. These concepts, and the vast amounts of empirical evidence gathered by sociologists, provide interesting points of departure for the analysis of problems in international relations. Much recent research and writing has been noticeably influenced by sociological concepts and methods, as the following brief review of some key efforts will demonstrate:

1. In the past, international relations specialists regarded the state—and often even more specifically the government—as the major "participant" in international relations and often did not carry their analysis below this presumably basic unit. Some recent efforts have discarded this facile assumption and have proceeded along lines emphasizing the social composition and structure of national societies. It has been widely recognized that crucial decisions are made by, and on behalf of, major

² Quincy Wright, *The Study of International Relations* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1955), Chap. 27.

interest groups. A recent textbook in international relations,³ bound to have a profound influence upon the discipline, presents a frankly sociological set of propositions based squarely on this recognition. The relevance of elites in the formulation and execution of state policies has been strongly stressed in a number of recent studies.⁴

2. On the question of how foreign policies are actually formulated within large governmental bureaucracies, a "decision-making" model has been developed which draws heavily on sociological concepts and terminology. A number of case studies and a text in American foreign policy largely follow this scheme and constitute valuable additions to existing literature.⁵

3. Much attention has been devoted to analyses of public opinion and propaganda. One of the outstanding works, drawing heavily on sociological concepts, is Gabriel Almond, *The American People and Foreign Policy* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1950). Almost any given issue of *The Public Opinion Quarterly* contains numerous articles of interest to the student of international relations.

4. Such phenomena as loyalty and patriotism are being subjected to new inquiries based on sociological concepts of group identification, subgroup structure, and reference group behavior.⁶

³ Haas and Whiting, *op. cit.*

⁴ See Harold D. Lasswell, Daniel Lerner, and C. Easton Rothwell, *The Comparative Study of Elites: An Introduction and Bibliography* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1952). Specific elite studies under this project include one on *The Nazi Elite* (Daniel Lerner), *The Politburo* (George K. Schuller), *The German Executive, 1890-1933* (Maxwell E. Knight), *Satellite Generals* (Ithiel de Sola Pool), and *Kuomintang and Chinese Communist Elites* (Robert C. North).

⁵ Richard C. Snyder, H. W. Bruck, and B. Sapin, *Decision-Making as an Approach to the Study of International Politics* (Princeton: Organizational Behavior Section, Princeton University, 1954). The specific studies are Burton M. Sapin, *An Appropriate Role for the Military in American Foreign Policy-Making: A Research Note*, and Edgar S. Furniss, Jr., *The Office of Premier in French Foreign Policy-Making: An Application of Decision-Making Analysis* (both, Princeton University, Organizational Behavior Section, 1954). The text is Richard C. Snyder and Edgar S. Furniss, Jr., *American Foreign Policy: Formulation, Principles and Programs* (New York: Rinehart and Co., 1955).

⁶ Morton Grodzins, *The Loyal and the Disloyal: Social Boundaries of Patriotism and Treason* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956). See also Harold S. Guetzkow, *Multiple Loyalties: Theoretical Approach to a Problem in International Organization* (Princeton: Publication of the Center for Research on World Political Institutions in the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, No. 4, 1955).

5. Much work has been done on the relationship between communication and the development of a sense of homogeneity among individuals and groups.⁷

6. The UNESCO Tensions Project ("Tensions Affecting International Understanding"), although so far primarily psychological in orientation, has drawn also on sociological concepts. A volume, just published, on *The Nature of Conflict: Studies on the Sociological Aspects of International Tensions* (by the International Sociological Association in collaboration with Jessie Bernard, T. H. Pear, Raymond Aron, and Robert C. Angell, UNESCO Tensions and Technology Series, 1957) contains a wealth of significant information which could provide the starting point for much thought and research.

7. A model of international relations entitled "Isolation and Collaboration: A Partial Theory of Inter-Nation Relations,"⁸ based on propositions of group behavior derived from social psychology and sociology, is an example of the type of suggestion with which these disciplines can enrich the study of international relations.

In a general way, one perceives in much recent international relations literature a tendency away from purely descriptive effort and toward sociologically oriented analyses of the institutions and phenomena under investigation. One can also identify an increasing interest in model- or system-building, combined with efforts to test hypotheses as precisely as the subject matter permits.

It may be noted that a number of the sociologically inspired studies described above deal with the participants in the process of international relations, not with the process itself. This is understandable, since the study of internal group structure and behavior occupies an important place in sociology. We know a great deal more today about the socioeconomic-political composition of national societies and the formulation and execution of their foreign policies than we did before. This is all to the good. Further work in these fields is certainly needed, especially if it leads to the formulation of typologies of foreign policy participants.

Unless, however, one is prepared to equate "foreign policy" with "international relations," one cannot be content with past selections and

⁷ Karl W. Deutsch, *Nationalism and Social Communication: An Inquiry into the Foundations of Nationality* (Cambridge: The Technology Press, 1953). Same author, *Political Community at the International Level: Problems of Definition and Measurement* (Princeton: Foreign Policy Analysis Series 2, 1953). See also Wright, *op. cit.*, Chap. 21, "International Communications."

⁸ *Conflict Resolution*, 1: 48-68. This new journal, incidentally, is designed to increase collaboration between specialists in international relations and behavioral scientists in general.

applications of sociological concepts and data on the part of international relations specialists and others. Additional aspects of sociology might well be utilized to throw new light on the phenomena of international life. One thinks of such topics as interaction behavior, group dynamics, status and role, conflict and cooperation. In addition, the international relations specialist would do well to acquaint himself with findings in social psychology and psychology relating to personality and behavior, learning, socialization, motivation, perception, stereotypes, prejudices, beliefs, attitudes, and opinions.

Obviously, no single person can hope to master all these complex topics. There is, therefore, a pressing need for specialized studies of single topics in sociology (and social psychology) and their relationship to problems of international relations, accompanied by manageable bibliographies. The sociologist could provide such studies. In addition, sociologists might well contribute some general surveys, paralleling such works in related fields as Mark A. May, *A Social Psychology of War and Peace* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1943) and T. H. Pear, ed., *Psychological Factors of Peace and War* (New York: The Philosophical Library, 1950).

It seems fair to say that an increasing number of international relations specialists are quite aware of the many contributions which sociology could make to their subject. Yet it also seems that, in practice, many of them find it difficult to implement this theoretical awareness in their teaching, research, and writing. (Possibly sociologists find themselves in similar difficulties when they attempt to integrate findings of international relations into their own work.) A number of conditions contribute to such difficulties.

On the one hand, the average international relations teacher or researcher, trained in history and political science, does not know enough sociology to be fully aware of its potential contributions to his own subject. He simply does not know what questions to ask or to suggest to the sociologist. Moreover, sociology (not unlike international relations) is a discipline full of lusty conflict and controversy, complicating the task of an outsider who hesitates to choose among alternatives about which experts disagree so vigorously. Sociology's highly specialized language, too, is a serious barrier. Sociology emphasizes precise measurement, while international relations specialists tend to think of their own subject as one where precise observation and measurement, however desirable, are often extraordinarily difficult, if not impossible. Finally, while sociology aspires to precision, it also seeks for generalizations concerning the phenomena which it investigates. The student of international

relations also hopes to generalize—eventually even to predict—but, at the same time, he feels that he must take account of many discrete differences in the composition and behavior of the units with which he deals.

On the other side of the potential linkage, the average sociologist is apt to be less than fully aware of ongoing work in international relations; he thus finds it difficult to communicate with his colleagues and contribute as much as he might. He, too, often does not know what questions to ask or to suggest to them. Quincy Wright attributes the sociologists' neglect of international relations to the fact that the field "presents peculiar difficulties either for direct observation or for statistical... analysis..."⁹ Although some sociologists have made distinguished contributions to the study of international relations, their number is limited. On the whole, it would seem, relatively few American sociologists have pursued lines of inquiry which are directly relevant to the international relations specialist.

Doubtlessly many sociologists are held back by the realization that the transfer of concepts from one field to another, while tempting, is always risky—especially when the transfer is from the study of relatively small groups in a relatively ordered environment to the study of huge groups in an all-but-chaotic environment. Still, although the groups involved and their environments differ, both sociology and international relations deal with the study of groups in their relations with their members and each other; and, unless some transfer of concepts and data is possible, the outsider may eventually wonder whether the claims of sociology are not exaggerated. In the writer's judgment, this suspicion would be unwarranted, but it is clearly the task of the sociologists themselves to demonstrate that this is the case.

A number of encouraging organizational developments¹⁰ and a growing awareness among students of international relations that theirs is truly a cross-disciplinary endeavor which depends heavily on other social sciences augur well for increasing collaboration between the two disciplines. But neither organizational facilitation nor purely theoretic (and possibly one-sided) willingness to work together can assure productive

⁹ Wright, *op. cit.*, Chap. 27.

¹⁰ These developments include the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences; curriculum revisions in several departments of International Relations and Political Science; the appearance of a new journal, *Conflict Resolution*; the digest of articles appearing in publications of other disciplines, including sociology, in *Background on World Politics*; the program of the Social Science Research Council; and the Ford Foundation's new International Relations Training Fellowship program.

relationships. For the student of international relations there are two alternatives: (1) he can add thorough training in sociology to his professional training in international relations and thus render himself capable of performing an integrating function between the two disciplines or (2) he can acquaint himself sufficiently well with the field of sociology, short of aspiring to expertize in it, to enable him to ask relevant questions.

The sociologist is confronted with the precise counterpart of these alternatives: either to become capable of integrating the work done in the two fields or else to place himself in a position where he can at least collaborate more fruitfully with the international relations specialist. A study of recent trends in international relations research and writing, in part reviewed in this article, may well persuade sociologists that they not only have much to communicate to students of international relations, but that there is also something to be gained for their own discipline through greater attention to the most massive types of group activity and interaction under investigation by social scientists.

SOCIAL CLASS AND STEREOTYPING*

THOMAS ELY LASSWELL

Grinnell College

Social stratification as a condition refers to an ideal construct of a society or social constituency which distinguishes categories of persons as relatively inferior or superior to one another. As a social process, it refers to a form of social differentiation. This specialized form of differentiation involves not only a distinction among categories but also a recognition of their inequality. There are, then, two elements necessary for the existence of social stratification: (1) the differentiation of categories of persons and (2) an evaluation of the indicated categories which results in inequalities.

It is imperative that a distinction be made between the general term "social stratification" and the specific term "social class stratification." Social class is but one of an indefinite number of referents for the differentiation of unequal strata in a social entity.

This paper is not concerned with superimposed classifications of populations, but rather with social classes as conceptualized by the constituents of the populations—the social classes whom they differentiate between, behave differentially toward, and of whom they expect differential behaviors, attributes, or possessions.

THE THEORETICAL POSITION

It has long been recognized that people make social class distinctions. On the other hand, it has become more recently established that the classes distinguished in the present-day United States are by no means uniform in number, size, or meaning.¹ The coexistence of these two facts need be neither inconsistent nor paradoxical. It is the purpose of this paper to illustrate with empirical data the theoretical position that the popular conceptions of social classes in the present-day United States are essentially comprised of sets of stereotypes rather than a uniform set of discrete, objectively defined population categories. Since class stereotypes

* Revision of a paper read at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Society, 1955.

¹ Cf. Robert E. L. Faris, "The Alleged Class System in the United States," *Research Studies of the State College of Washington*, XXII: 77-83, June 1954.

reflect class-oriented attitudes, behaviors, and expectations, they are of importance in understanding and interpreting social interaction.

A stereotype is here defined as a preconceived, unscientific generalization about persons or categories of persons.

THE HYPOTHESES

Data to test four hypotheses have been gathered. The hypotheses are: (I) that substantial numbers of people have some preconception of social class distinctions, (II) that these people have attached preconceived generalizations about social class constituents to each class distinguished, (III) that the number of social class distinctions that will be made in any specific community is not predictable from more general data, and (IV) that the specific content of the generalizations about each social class constituents in any specific community is not predictable from general data.

THE FINDINGS

The data for this paper have been assembled from the current literature on social stratification and from 262 descriptions of social class stratification patterns obtained from the following sources: 56 personal interviews with an area sample of residents of a California community, 134 papers prepared by students in English classes at George Pepperdine College, 21 papers prepared by student nurses at the Huntington Memorial Hospital School of Nursing, and 51 papers prepared by students in introductory sociology at Grinnell College.

Hypothesis I: Substantial numbers of people have some preconceptions of social class distinctions. Ample support for this hypothesis has been given both explicitly and implicitly in the literature.² It is again sup-

² For a list of examples, see A. B. Hollingshead, *Elmtown's Youth: The Impact of Social Classes on Adolescents* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1949), pp. 25-26; for more recent examples, see J. G. Manis and B. N. Meltzer, "Attitudes of Textile Workers to Class Structure," *American Journal of Sociology*, LX: 30-35, July 1954; A. B. Hollingshead, "Trends in Social Stratification: A Case Study," *American Sociological Review*, 17: 679-86, December 1952; Paul K. Hatt and Virginia Ktsanes, "Patterns of American Stratification as Reflected in Selected Social Science Literature," *American Sociological Review*, 17: 670-79, December 1952; Gideon Sjoberg, "Are Social Classes in America Becoming More Rigid?" *American Sociological Review*, 16: 775-83, December 1951; Harold F. Kaufman, "An Approach to the Study of Urban Stratification," *American Sociological Review*, 17: 434, August 1952; Neal Gross, "Social Class Identification in the Urban Community," *American Sociological Review*, 18: 398-404, August 1953; and Stanley A. Hetzler, "An Investigation of the Distinctiveness of Social Classes," *American Sociological Review*, 18: 493-97, October 1953.

ported in the study at hand. If two is taken as the smallest number of classes comprising a system, then 83.6 per cent of the respondents described a stratification pattern which identified discrete classes. Although the remainder of the respondents failed to describe a system, only four persons (1.5 per cent) denied the existence of social classes.

Hypothesis II: When class distinctions are made, the persons making them conceptualize generalizations about social class constituents for each class distinguished. The literature which pertains to this hypothesis may be divided into two varieties. (1) In some writings, the authors distinguish a social class or classes to their own satisfactions and then describe general qualities, attributes, behaviors, or treatments of those designated as class constituents. This is evidence of the author's acceptance of the notion that there is some general relationship between social class as an independent variable and specific dependent variables, presumably distinguishable or potentially so from those dependent variables associated with other classes.³ In other writings, the authors report that a number of other persons have in some quantifiable way indicated a relationship between the social class assignment and qualities, attributes, behaviors, or treatments of assignees.⁴ In either case, it is clear from the literature that many popular and scholarly conceptions relate social class to general qualities, attributes, behaviors, or treatments of social class constituents.

There were 3,291 items used by the respondents in this study to describe social classes, class constituents, or criteria for distinguishing among classes. In no instance where a class system was identified was there failure to associate some generalized conception of behaviors, treatments, attributes, or qualities with some specific class or classes.

Hypothesis III: The null hypothesis that the number of social class distinctions that are made is not predictable generally is also widely supported. Perhaps the most convincing evidence in this area is found

³ E.g., Leonard Riessman, "Levels of Aspiration and Social Class," *American Sociological Review*, 18: 233-42, June 1953; C. Wright Mills, *White Collar: The American Middle Classes* (New York: Oxford University Press), 1951; Russell Lynes, "Highbrow, Lowbrow, Middlebrow," *Harper's Magazine*, CXCVIII: 19-28, February 1949; Alfred C. Kinsey, W. B. Pomeroy, and C. E. Martin, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* (Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Co., 1948), pp. 327-93; and Martha C. Ericson, "Child-Rearing and Social Status," *American Journal of Sociology*, LII: 190-92, November 1946.

⁴ E.g., Hollingshead, *Elmtown's Youth*, cit.; Arnold M. Rose, "The Popular Meaning of Class Designation," *Sociology and Social Research*, 38: 14-21, September-October 1953; Richard Centers, "Social Class, Occupation, and Imputed Belief," *American Journal of Sociology*, LVIII: 543-55, May 1953.

in the varying numbers of class distinctions reported in different studies.⁵ Several empirical studies have shown that conceptions of social class distinctions vary in the number of classes distinguished within single communities.⁶ If there is a scientifically ascertainable pattern by which social class distinctions are generally made, there is no evidence of any consensus upon it in the literature.

The number of classes named by respondents in the empirical study presented here ranged from none to nine, with the mode of three being selected by slightly more than one third (35.5%) of the respondents. At Grinnell, the number of classes named ranged from one to eight; at Huntington, two to six; at Pepperdine, two to nine; and in Citrus City, none to seven.

Hypothesis IV: The fourth hypothesis deals with the dependent variables contained in the generalizations about differentiated social classes. There is little doubt that scholars differ in regard to the major criteria involved in the process of social class stratification and in regard to the exact correlatives of the various social classes.⁷ It is not argued here that there may not be a multiplicity of both criteria and correlatives involved in popular social class assignments, but it is doubtful that all of the persons who make class assignments employ all of the criteria suggested to the same extent or agree on all of the suggested correlatives.⁸

A number of authors have reported observed or expected variations in

⁵ Among the many who have commented on this are Hetzler, *op. cit.*, p. 494; Harold W. Pfautz, "The Current Literature on Social Stratification; Critique and Bibliography," *American Journal of Sociology*, LVIII: 395, January 1953; and Llewellyn Gross, "The Use of Class Concepts in Sociological Research," *American Journal of Sociology*, LIV: 417, March 1949.

⁶ Neal Gross, *op. cit.*; Hollingshead, *Elmtown's Youth*, *cit.*, pp. 30-32; Manis and Meltzer, *op. cit.*; and Gerhard E. Lenski, "American Social Classes: Statistical Strata or Social Groups?" *American Journal of Sociology*, LVIII: 139-44, September 1952.

⁷ Cf. Hollingshead, "Trends in Social Stratification," *cit.*, p. 679; Llewellyn Gross, *op. cit.*, pp. 409-21; Pfautz, *op. cit.*; and Milton M. Gordon, "Social Class in American Sociology," *American Journal of Sociology*, LV: 265, November 1949.

⁸ For a sample of criteria and correlatives used, see Leonard Reissman, "Class, Leisure, and Social Participation," *American Sociological Review*, 19: 83, February 1954; Pfautz, *op. cit.*, pp. 395-96; Robert J. Havighurst, "Social Class and Basic Personality Structure," *Sociology and Social Research*, 36: 355-63, July-August 1952; Centers, *op. cit.*; W. Lloyd Warner, "The Significance of Caste and Class in a Democracy," *The Social Welfare Forum*, 1953, pp. 289-301; Leonard Schatzman and Anselm Strauss, "Social Class and Modes of Communication," *American Journal of Sociology*, LX: 329-38, January 1955; and Liston Pope, "Religion and the Class Structure," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 256: 84-91, March 1948.

the criteria or correlatives of social class in different communities,⁹ in the same community,¹⁰ or in otherwise homogeneous or heterogeneous social constituencies.¹¹

As more and more data become available, it becomes increasingly clear that social classes are not absolute, palpable entities, and that the popular designations and connotations of social class vary over a wide range in the United States. The conceptions of social classes certainly vary from group to group and appear to have no greater uniformity than could be accounted for by differential experience and differential communication.

With respect to the empirical study presented here, the fourth hypothesis requires an inspection of the specific content of the generalizations made about class constituents. Two questions should be answered: (1) Do people in general define social classes with reference to a uniform set of values? (2) If or when the same values are involved, are criteria which are related to them uniform?

In answer to the first question, the 3,291 items supplied by respondents were categorized according to the thirty-two value referents listed below:

I. Expected behaviors, beliefs, or attitudes of class constituents:

- A. Occupation and occupational expectations
- B. Participation in community and civic affairs
- C. Attitudes toward education and educational achievements
- D. Outlook
- E. Religion and religious behavior
- F. Social and spatial mobility
- G. Marriage and family behavior
- H. Choice of associates
- I. Morals and attitudes toward law
- J. Care and training of children
- K. Living habits
- L. Attitudes toward others
- M. Wants and aspirations
- N. Other behaviors and beliefs

⁹ Mozell C. Hill and Bevode C. McCall, "Social Stratification in 'Georgia Town,'" *American Sociological Review*, 15: 729, December 1950; and Carson McGuire, "Social Stratification and Mobility Patterns," *American Sociological Review*, 15: 196, April 1950.

¹⁰ Lenski, *op. cit.*, pp. 143-44; Harold W. Pfautz and Otis Dudley Duncan, "A Critical Evaluation of Warner's Work in Community Stratification," *American Sociological Review*, 15: 213-14, April 1950; and Manis and Meltzer, *op. cit.*, pp. 32-33.

¹¹ Centers, *op. cit.*, p. 555; Sjoberg, *op. cit.*, p. 783; Hadley Cantril, "Identification with Social and Economic Class," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 38: 78-80, January 1943; Kaufman, *op. cit.*, pp. 433-34; and Rose, *op. cit.*

- II. Expected treatments by others or behavior of others in the presence of class constituents:
 - A. Social acceptance
 - B. Breadth of acquaintance
 - C. Publicity
 - D. Power relationships
 - E. Miscellaneous treatments by others
- III. Objective attributes, characteristics, qualities, or possessions of class constituents:
 - A. Housing
 - B. Residential area
 - C. Amount or source of income
 - D. Ethnic group or national origin
 - E. Wealth (in abstract terms)
 - F. Personal characteristics
 - G. Lineage
 - H. Specific material possessions other than housing or wealth
 - I. Conceptions of self
 - J. Number of children
 - K. Servants
 - L. Ascribed status, power, or prestige
 - M. Leisure

A comparison of the frequency of occurrence of items in these categories was made. Rank correlations for those categories with statistically adequate numbers of items were made according to the groups of respondents. Most of the correlations were quite low, although an r of .63 was found between the Pepperdine group and the Grinnell group. The other r correlations were as follows: Grinnell and Huntington, .331; Pepperdine and Huntington, .251; Citrus City and Huntington, .137; Citrus City and Grinnell, .119; Citrus City and Pepperdine, -.167. Inspection of the raw data revealed marked individual differences in the values associated with social class. The low correlations show that there are also measurable group differences.

Are criteria which are related to the same values, when they occur, uniform? Rose has shown that they are not in at least one area.¹² A tendency toward uniformity was observed in the extreme classes designated by respondents from the same group who described five or more classes. However, the conclusion must be that, as in ethnic stereotypes, some elements recur with greater frequency than others but that there is insufficient evidence of either precision or uniformity in the total con-

¹² Rose, *op. cit.*

figuration to argue that the local generalizations about class constituents are subject to scientific predictability from general findings.

DISCUSSION

This paper does not question the usefulness, precision, or validity of studies which make use of superimposed stratification patterns to describe or analyze social entities or social phenomena. It does suggest, however, that a clear distinction should be made between *superimposed* stratification patterns (where a social entity is stratified by uniform criteria related to income, education, occupation, and the like, or any combination of such) and *functional social class* stratification patterns.

The current research reports and the study reported here are in accord on the four hypotheses tested. The data show that most people do have preconceived notions about social classes and their existence, and that these notions are comprised, in part at least, of generalizations about the persons who are considered to be members of the conceptualized social classes. Such generalizations appear to have no over-all uniformity on any national, regional, or local scale. There is no consensus as to their total content. If a scientific basis for the social differentiation of social class categories or for a scale for their evaluation exists, no evidence of it was found in the study. It is therefore concluded that the various popular conceptions of social classes in the present-day United States are comprised of sets of stereotypes.

The position that popular conceptions of social classes are sets of stereotypes has several theoretical and methodological implications. First, it implies that social classes are not necessarily social groups. Second, it accounts for discrepancies in social class assignments. Third, it accounts for both uniformities and differences reported in local or national patterns of social class stratification. Fourth, it does not require a general causal relationship between social class as a basis for stratification and other specific criteria for social differentiation. Fifth, it accounts for differences in the number of social classes reported in a given locality. Sixth, such a position broadens the horizon for future research by providing one clue to a theoretical framework that is consistent with empirical findings in the area of social class and class-oriented attitudes and behaviors.

"OUR SCHIZOID CULTURE" AND SOCIOPATHY*

READ BAIN
Miami University

Both before and after "Our Schizoid Culture," I published several papers on "social pathology"¹ and suggested that "schizoid" traits can be measured objectively. Little has been done along this line, and none of it is based on systematic theory that commands much consensus among experts.² So the over-all picture in 1957 remains similar to what I called "schizoid" traits in 1933.

However, at least four sociopathic changes have occurred since the thirties. First, despite another war to save democracy and end war, democracy has declined and the earth is an armed camp. Second, military men hold key positions in government and industry and many universities have become adjuncts of the armed services. Third, large corporations have gained in dominance. That some are more socially intelligent than formerly and are less dominated by crude greed and graft is only a partial offset. Fourth, these and other sociopathic factors seriously menace science. It is increasingly difficult to publish theoretical research.

*Read at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Society, Washington, D.C., August 27, 1957.

¹ "The Concept of Complexity in Sociology, I," *Social Forces*, VIII: 222-31; and "II," VIII: 369-78; "The Concept of Social Process," Publications of the American Sociological Society, August 1932, pp. 10-18; "Our Schizoid Culture," *Sociology and Social Research*, XIX: 266-76; "Sociology and Psychoanalysis," *American Sociological Review*, I: 203-20, and "Technology and State Government," II: 860-74; "Theory and Practice of State Administration," *American Political Science Review*, 33: 495-508; "Cultural Integration and Social Conflict," *American Journal of Sociology*, XLIV: 499-509; "Freedom, Law, and Social Control," *Journal of Social Philosophy*, 4: 220-36; "Morale for War and Peace," *Social Forces*, 21: 418-25; "Sociopathy and World Organization," *Social Forces*, 22: 127-38; "Man, the Myth-Maker," *Scientific Monthly*, 33: 61-69; "The Concept of Sociopathy," *Sociology and Social Research*, 38: 1-6; "Sociopathy of the Dog-Complex," unpublished but read before the Ohio Valley Sociological Society, Cleveland, April 25, 1955.

² Two possible exceptions are E. L. Thorndike, *Your City and 144 Smaller Cities* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1939 and 1940); and Robert C. Angell, *The Integration of American Society: A Study of Groups and Institutions* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1941). Neither author was directly concerned with sociopathic traits though some of Thorndike's data can be used for such analysis. Angell deals mainly with integrative factors and presents a much too optimistic picture, in my opinion.

"Theory" is often not even regarded as "research." "Research" means only "practical, applied, empirical investigation." The National Research Foundation estimates that 87 per cent of federal research funds go to physical science, 11 per cent to biological, and only 2 per cent to all social sciences combined. All nonfederal research money shows about the same proportions, except that social science gets only 1 per cent—and most of it goes for "practical" and "applied" research.

If we continue to neglect basic theoretical research, science will soon stagnate. This is especially true of social science, which has little valid theory and little interest in it. If social science fails to produce valid theories and techniques of social control, we may be destroyed by the applications of physical and biological science.

"Our Schizoid Culture" employed loose language in places and thus obscured what I think was, and is, its sound thesis. A few instances of this will be noted and then the thesis will be restated as a theory of sociopathy.

The title is somewhat misleading. It implies that culture is an *entity* rather than a *name* for symbol-mediated behavior.³ It also implies that "cultures" can have mental illnesses. Actually, *personalities* are the only social structures that can have such diseases. Cultures, and all other social structures except personalities, can be *sociopathic*, and all are so afflicted to some degree, as all personalities have mild-to-severe psychopathic symptoms. Page 267 ("Our Schizoid Culture") implies that societal conflicts *cause* mental illness and that such conflicts *are* sociopathic. *Some* societal conflicts do "cause" *some* mental illness in *some* people, but not in all, or even in most. Also if two social structures are in conflict or there is conflict within one or both of them, one or both or neither may be sociopathic. Conflict is the *name* of social behavior that may be either sociopathic or hygienic. Also the contradictions and conflicts are stated as if they are distinct entities. Actually, they are "ideal-type" end-terms of continua. Rigorous, measurable criteria of amount and intensity must be formulated before any specific behavior can be called sociopathic.

Two other positions are taken near the end of the paper which may be questioned. The first suggests that originality and leadership are produced by cultural conflict. This is a variety of the "Great Man" theory of history and close to Freud's idea that "creativity" is a result of intrapersonal conflict caused by superego repression of the ego in its

³ "A Definition of Culture," *Sociology and Social Research*, December 1942, pp. 87-94.

striving against idic, or idiotic, impulses. Sidney Hook has restated the "Great Man" theory plausibly by distinguishing between "eventful" and "event-making" men. He pulverizes the naive idea that *all* social change stems from outstanding individuals but argues persuasively that some men in some historic situations are effective in changing the course of history.⁴ The second is the idea that the elimination of conflict and cultural contradictions might destroy the dynamics of adaptive change. That cultural integration is a sort of *dunkler Drang* which, if achieved, would destroy society and that the "core of unreason" is necessary for survival is Hegelianism in reverse. It is as unlikely as Hegel's notion of an inscrutable "Absolute" working blindly toward perfection. Despite the suggestion that integration may be self-destructive, the paper ends on an optimistic *non sequitur*.

If one denies all absolutes, purposes, and values except the limited, relative, and transitory ones made by man, then both positive and negative Hegelianism becomes absurd. The universe is neither good nor bad, orderly nor chaotic. It merely exists and changes. Order and disorder are relative, man-made culturally defined terms dependent for meaning on implicit and explicit values. Reality is man's verbalized, or culturally defined, experience which is always partial and relative. Man is confronted with continuous change and changing ways of dealing with it. The ways that "work," that gain his ends as he conceives them, are named "good," rational, healthy, and integrative. Those that seem to prevent or destroy the things he values are named "evil," irrational, unhealthy, and disintegrative. All values are subject to redefinition, or even reversal, as new experience, knowledge, and goals are formulated. It is certain the man-species will finally disappear, but it is also certain that man's final fate, saving cosmic catastrophe, will be hastened or delayed by his own behavior. Acts that hasten species-extinction or interfere with value-maximization are "pathological"; those that delay individual and species death and maximize values are "healthy."

This is how "Our Schizoid Culture" and the other papers mentioned impress me today. We can conclude with a brief statement of my present theory of sociopathy.

Structure and function are reciprocals. Pathology may refer to either, but all malfunctioning logically implies some structural pathology. Hence, a systematic classification of social structures is required for any

⁴ Sidney Hook, *The Hero in History* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1955, first published in 1943), whole volume but especially Chapter IX.

adequate theory of sociopathy. Ten or fifteen years ago I was satisfied with five general classes of social structures, one of which was residual. Now I recognize fifteen, one of which is still residual and will probably give rise to several more as knowledge increases. Systematic classification of social structures is highly unsatisfactory, but the work of Ray, Linne, and Mendelev shows conclusively that sound, systematic morphological classification has been a powerful factor in the development of all the natural sciences.

"Mind" is the *name* for the verbal and other symbol-mediated behavior of a class of social structures named "personality." Minds and personalities can be pathological. So can any other type of social structure. Biological illness and defect can cause both mental and social sickness, but usually doesn't. Mental illness can cause both biological and social pathology, but usually doesn't. Social structures, including personalities, can also be sick and may produce biological and mental illness, but usually do not.

Biopathy, psychopathy, and sociopathy are good names for these three classes of pathological behavior. If physiopathy be included to refer to instability in physical systems judged to menace man's values, we have a systematic terminology for all possible types of pathological phenomena. They are all interactive because functioning modifies structure. Science must describe all pathology in rigorous denotative terms to avoid the confusion inherent in analogies and other figures of speech. No social structure, except a personality, can have paranoia, any more than a carburetor can have typhoid. Social structures can be sociopathic, but they do not and cannot have biological and psychological diseases. They can and do have sociopathic traits which can be named. Crime, poverty, waste, graft, etc., are common-sense names for such sociopathic traits. Other more technical terms will be required as more scientific knowledge about social structures and their functioning is gained.

Persons who are mildly biopathic and psychopathic can, and usually do, function acceptably in severely sociopathic structures such as war and our present economic system and also in such relatively nonsociopathic structures as a home or a school. All human bodies, personalities, and other social structures exhibit some mild-to-severe pathology, but they are not called "pathological" so long as they function within the limits of tolerated deviation from social norms. Persons with mild mental ailments, both psychoid and neuroid, and mild biopathic traits like headaches and stomach-aches do not function with maximum

efficiency in social structures, but such persons are not usually regarded as being "sick." Specialists know that much pathology of all three kinds is tolerated because many social norms are themselves sociopathic.

How do we know a machine, organism, personality, or other social structure is pathological? Mainly by common sense but increasingly by the judgment of specialists. What has small significance to the layman may have great significance to the engineer, doctor, psychiatrist, or social scientist, and vice versa. The car driver says "a funny noise," but the good mechanic says "cracked valve"; the layman says "just a lump—doesn't hurt," but the doctor says "cancer"; the college boy says "self-confidence and will-power," but the psychiatrist says "incipient paranoia"; the priest says "divorce threatens the family institution," but the family specialist says "divorce is sometimes the best sociotherapy for sociopathic family life."

Specialists discover and classify the symptoms and causes of pathological behavior. When scientific knowledge is lacking, treatment may be futile or disastrous, whether the pathological structure be a carburetor, organism, personality, or economic system. Some common-sense diagnoses and treatments at all four levels are empirically useful. If so, they will be confirmed and improved by science; if not, they will be discarded when better ways are found. Science is merely refined, tested, and generalized common sense.

Only personalities can be *mentally* ill. Carburetors, digestive systems, and bridge clubs cannot, although all are structurally and functionally pathological in varying degrees, and all are functionally interrelated. Healthy personalities are social structures produced by the impact of other physical and social structures on human organisms that have specific genetic and acquired potentialities and limitations. Mentally *ill* personalities are produced by these same interacting factors. The kinds and degrees of mental illness, and the possible therapies for them, require intensive cooperative research in all four fields. Specific factors in each field may be pathogenic in some situations and hygienic in others.

This illustration can be generalized because all other social structures are the products of interacting personalities, directly or indirectly. Medical diagnosis was largely based on symptoms and animistic thinking for thousands of years. Only with the development of natural science did reliable etiological diagnosis and treatment become possible. Sociopathic diagnosis is largely nosological at present. An effective social etiology will emerge only after we have constructed a sound systematic classification of

all social structures and their functioning. I think we are on the verge of such a development. The main reason for this optimistic opinion is the relativity-unity-of-science movement.

In the meantime, despite our crude and tentative classification of social structures and our lack of scientific knowledge about their functioning, it is possible to state some tentative generalized criteria for the observation and measurement of sociopathic factors.

A social structure is sociopathic when (1) it contains logical conflicts and contradictions within its ideology and functioning, (2) it interferes with normal development and functioning of other relatively nonsociopathic structures, (3) it violates the laws of any democratic political unit, (4) it costs too much or wastes physical and human resources, (5) it adversely affects the mental and biological health of its members, (6) it does not adjust its ideology and practices quickly and adequately to changes in other social structures, (7) it rationalizes its own ideology and practices by utilizing the ideological prestige of other social structures. The last is one of the most prevalent forms of sociopathy, especially in advertising, political, and religious behavior. For example, some newspapers have opposed the application of child labor laws to newsboys "because" it interferes with "freedom of the press and free enterprise"; totalitarians claim to be the only "true democrats"; many Christians claim that natural science was "caused" by Christianity. In such cases, the fallacies of transposition, *petitio principii*, *post hoc ergo propter hoc*, *non sequitur*, etc., are obvious to any critical mind.

This is not intended as a definitive list of criteria for sociopathy. Some of the above may be invalid, and better criteria will certainly be formulated as empirical research accumulates. Eventually, a useful systematic classification of social structures and functioning will be attained; a science-based etiology and therapy will supplant our present common-sense nosology and treatment of sociopathic symptoms. This is the "far-off divine event" toward which the whole development of social science moves.

Eventually, we shall diagnose and treat societal ills with the same surety and social acceptance the doctor now has in diagnosing and treating typhoid. A social scientist who pronounces the organization or functioning of a social structure sociopathic and suggests a remedy will not be met by the sneer that this is only "one man's opinion," or "egg-head nonsense," or a "mere analogy." Societal diseases are as "real" as biological and psychiatric diseases.

THE CONTINUUM THEORY OF SOCIAL STRATIFICATION: A CRITICAL NOTE*

ROBERT A. ELLIS

Stanford University

One result of the agonizing reappraisal that stratification research has undergone during the past decade has been the emergence of a new frame of reference for interpreting stratification data. This is the so-called "continuum theory of social stratification," which has received its most comprehensive treatment as well as its strongest support from Cuber and Kenkel.¹ In supporting their theoretical position, Cuber and Kenkel have adopted a highly critical attitude toward the social class researches undertaken by Hollingshead and Warner.² At the same time, they have failed to uncover any fundamental defects in the more recent researches which sustain the continuum theory.³ This one-sided critical scrutiny of the stratification literature in their textbook, with its clear implication that the continuum theory researches are free from logical and methodological error, conveys to the reader the impression that these data furnish a decisive basis for refuting the social class hypothesis that has been set forth by Hollingshead and Warner. This paper will endeavor to correct this erroneous impression. The continuum theory researches will be critically re-examined in order to show that from both a logical and a methodological standpoint these studies have been inadequately designed for the task of disproving the social class hypothesis.

Methodologically, the continuum theory researches can be criticized on two points: First, no true replication studies have been conducted. Even in Lenski's attempted replication of Hollingshead's Elmtown study,⁴ which Cuber and Kenkel cite as a rare instance of a replication study,⁵ the judges' rating technique employed by Lenski differed funda-

*Revision of paper presented at the annual meeting of the Pacific Sociological Society, Eugene, Oregon, April 19, 1957.

¹ John F. Cuber and William F. Kenkel, *Social Stratification in the United States* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1954), pp. 23-28.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 123-31, 187-91, 303-09.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 103-07, 153-55, 305-09.

⁴ Gerhard E. Lenski, "American Social Classes: Statistical Strata or Social Groups?" *American Journal of Sociology*, 58: 139-44, September 1952.

⁵ Cuber and Kenkel are in error when they state that Lenski's research procedures duplicated those employed by Warner. Lenski relied upon the judges' rating technique as a stratification procedure rather than the more complex, but less explicit, method of Evaluated Participation. See Cuber and Kenkel, *op. cit.*, p. 288.

mentally from that used by Hollingshead. For example, in his attempt to delineate the social class structure of Danielson, Lenski did not take the elaborate precautions that Hollingshead did to insure that persons with a marginal position in the community were excluded from the list of ratees.⁶ Consequently, the absence of empirical evidence of social cleavages in Lenski's research, as well as in other continuum theory studies, may just as likely be attributed to the different stratification procedures used as to the greater validity of the continuum frame of reference. Second, it may be pointed out that continuum theory researches have been no more free from methodological inadequacies than have been the researches which substantiate the social class standpoint. An apt illustration of this is again provided by Lenski's study. Among other things, his research may be criticized for employing a purposively selected sample of raters for the task of judging social prestige. This creates in Lenski's research the same possibility of a sample bias as has been the subject of criticism in the investigations conducted by Hollingshead and Warner—particularly, since Lenski included himself as one of the raters.⁷ Consequently, whatever doubt might be cast upon the reliability and validity of the data presented in social class researches may also be cast upon the reliability and validity of the data presented in researches supporting the continuum theory.

From a logical standpoint, the practice most vulnerable to criticism in the continuum theory investigations is that of attempting to refute the social class hypothesis with evidence totally irrelevant for that purpose. A case in point is Kenkel's study of social stratification in Columbus, Ohio.⁸ His effort to reject Warner's categorical approach on the basis of the finding that the hierarchical distribution of occupational prestige in Columbus did not reveal any discernible evidence of a cleavage effect constitutes, in essence, an attempt to demolish a "straw man." This result only confirms what Warner has already reported and demonstrated: namely, the single factor of occupation does not provide a satisfactory means for accurately assigning individuals to their appropriate social class.⁹ It was this limitation of the occupational scale, despite

⁶ Cf. August B. Hollingshead, *Elmtown's Youth* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1949), pp. 29-40; Gerhard E. Lenski, "Prestige, Status, and Wealth" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1950), pp. 74-84.

⁷ See Lenski, *op. cit.*, p. 75.

⁸ William F. Kenkel, "An Experimental Analysis of Social Stratification in Columbus, Ohio" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1952). A summary of Kenkel's findings is presented in Cuber and Kenkel, *op. cit.*, pp. 132-56.

⁹ W. Lloyd Warner, Marchia Meeker, and Kenneth Eells, *Social Class in America* (Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1949), pp. 163-75.

its demonstrated high correlation with social class position as measured by the method of Evaluated Participation, that led Warner to develop his four-factor Index of Status Characteristics. Consequently, it is not surprising that, with reliance on class boundaries arbitrarily drawn on an occupational scale, Kenkel also failed to demonstrate that "... most people would remain within their 'class' for most of their intimate associations."¹⁰ Adding to the variance that might be expected in Kenkel's results is the fact he employed the North-Hatt and not the Warner occupational scale in the Columbus research. Thus, studies such as Kenkel's pose the problem of relevance, a problem that would appear to be solved best by setting up "crucial experiments" which analyze the distribution of social prestige in small communities. It is in this type of research setting that the core data for the categorical theory of social stratification have been collected. Studies of this latter type have been attempted by Duncan and Artis, Lasswell, and, of course, Lenski, but even in these researches the logic of their design may be questioned.¹¹

Both Lasswell and Lenski have failed to distinguish analytically between the population's conceptions of the social structure and the researcher's conceptualization of the social order which has been abstracted from these data. The result is that Lasswell and Lenski have given no recognition to the logical possibility of treating both the class structure and the prestige continuum as theoretical constructs. Instead, futile concern has been devoted to the reality of the conceptual scheme that they have evolved.¹² This process of reification has only served to impede the empirical resolution of the conceptual issue at hand. It has distracted the analysts from the basic task of testing the validity of their construct by their ability to demonstrate its empirical determinacy and its systematic implications for the patterning of social behavior—what may be termed its sociological relevance.¹³

¹⁰ Cuber and Kenkel, *op. cit.*, p. 153.

¹¹ Otis Dudley Duncan and Jay W. Artis, "Some Problems of Stratification Research," *Rural Sociology*, 16: 17-29, March 1951; Thomas E. Lasswell, "A Study of Social Stratification Using an Area Sample of Raters," *American Sociological Review*, 19: 310-13, June 1954; Lenski, *op. cit.*

¹² Implicit in Lenski's argument over whether social classes are statistical strata or social groups is the hypothesis that social classes are not real and prestige continuums are real.

¹³ The present writer concurs with Kaufman's statement: "Except for the fact that [writers who have distinguished between the 'real' and 'nominalistic' notions of class] regard their definitions of class as the 'real' ones, the basis for this distinction is not entirely clear. . . . The basic question is not whether the class concept is 'real' or 'nominal,' but (1) By what procedures is it defined? and (2) How is it related to other constructs—the content of the term?" See Hollingshead *et al.*, "Community Research: Development and Present Condition," *American Sociological Review*, 13: 148, April 1948.

This misleading concern with the reality of social class has been carefully avoided by Duncan and Artis in their well-designed and thorough analysis of social stratification in a Pennsylvania rural community. Instead of being exclusively preoccupied with the verbal descriptions of the social structure that were reported by the local inhabitants, these investigators specifically endeavored to obtain independent behavioral evidence to confirm the presence of disjunctive social classes in the community. Following a procedure suggested by Loomis and his associates,¹⁴ Duncan and Artis made a sociometric analysis of the informal association patterns observed in the community in order to ascertain if there were signs of either a clustering effect or a cleavage effect which might indicate the presence of social classes. Their finding that "... inspection of sociometric charts gives no indication of the most appropriate breaking points for such [class] divisions" would appear to demonstrate the untenableness of the social class hypothesis in this situation.¹⁵ However, the question may be raised as to whether sociometric procedures have been used appropriately in this instance. For Duncan and Artis to use sociometrics in such inductive fashion, it would appear necessary for them to assume that similarity of class positions operates as a sufficient condition for persons to engage in intimate association. Otherwise, the channeling effect premised for social class may be obscured or contravened by the operation of other sociological and psychological factors which contribute to the patterning of social relationships. Since this assumption of sufficiency clearly is not warranted,¹⁶ the failure of Duncan and Artis to induce a well-demarcated set of social classes from the complexly determined friendship constellations they observed in the community may possibly be due to the inherent impracticableness of this task and not to the untenableness of the social class hypothesis.

In conclusion, this critical examination reveals the presence of basic logical and methodological flaws in the stratification researches which sustain the continuum theory, thereby indicating that their evidence does not furnish an adequate basis for rejecting the validity of the social class concept. This does not signify that by the failure of these researches to stand the test of close methodological scrutiny, their findings "must

¹⁴ C. P. Loomis, J. A. Beegle, and T. W. Longmore, "Critique of Class as Related to Social Stratification," *Sociometry*, 10: 319-37, November 1947.

¹⁵ Duncan and Artis, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

¹⁶ See Robert A. Ellis, "Social Status and Social Distance," *Sociology and Social Research*, 40: 240-46, March-April 1956.

be regarded as more factious than factual."¹⁷ It does signify, however, that further refinement must be made in the logic and in the research procedures used in social stratification analysis before the class-continuum controversy can be resolved. A successful resolution of this conceptual issue will, it is thought, depend upon the researchers' recognizing that the problem which confronts them entails choosing between two different conceptual schemes, one of which is more parsimonious than the other. Thus if the continuum frame of reference furnishes as satisfactory an explanation of stratification phenomena as does the categorical frame of reference, then it is logically inappropriate to make the additional assumption that the social order is demarcated by commonly recognized and behaviorally relevant social cleavages. On the other hand, the task faced by the adherents of the categorical frame of reference is to demonstrate the theoretical fertility of their less parsimonious conceptual scheme. If the additional assumption of a cleavage effect provides empirically verifiable predictions about the patterning of social behavior that are not rendered by reliance on the continuum frame of reference, then the validity of the categorical standpoint can be considered to have been demonstrated.¹⁸

¹⁷ This position has been taken by Cuber and Kenkel in their critical appraisal of social class researches. (Cuber and Kenkel, *op. cit.*, p. vi.) It is, however, a position that is scientifically untenable, for it represents a curious inversion of the entire scientific process. Instead of requiring that scientific doubt ultimately be subjected to empirical resolution, these authors imply that it is sufficient to resolve these doubts logically. The result of such a doctrine, whereby "general skepticism" becomes a sufficient cause for the rejection of empirical findings, can only be the stagnation of scientific inquiry and a retardation in the advancement of scientific knowledge. Indeed, it comes as no surprise to find that the voluminous critical literature in the area of social stratification, which apparently has been written in adherence to this doctrine of skepticism, has had little effect in stimulating further empirical inquiry.

¹⁸ This solution to the class-continuum dilemma has been suggested by Mayer. See Kurt Mayer, *Class and Society* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Company, 1955), p. 54.

ATTITUDES TOWARD DATING AMONG THE STUDENTS OF A MICHIGAN HIGH SCHOOL*

PANOS D. BARDIS
Albion College

In a recent publication¹ the writer discussed the findings of a study conducted in 1955 and dealing with attitudes toward dating and related practices among 198 foreign students at Purdue University. Similar studies have been conducted among 113 students of a Michigan high school, 351 male students of a Michigan college, 496 female students of the same college, and 141 students of a Canadian high school.

The present paper deals with the findings of the above-mentioned Michigan high school study. Besides analyzing the subjects' attitudes toward dating and related practices, an effort is made to determine the extent to which sex and age influence such attitudes. Furthermore, the students' responses dealing with the ages at which they actually began to date are compared with those pertaining to the ages at which the respondents believed that young people in general should begin to date.

The sample consisted of 113 upperclassmen—juniors and seniors—of a high school located in a Michigan city with a population of 8,600 and an industrial economy. All the subjects were native Americans, white, and single. Forty-seven were males and 66 females. Six were 16 years old, 59 were 17, 42 were 18, 4 were 19, 1 was 20, and the remaining 1 was 21.

The data were collected in May 1956 by means of personal interviews conducted on the basis of a schedule² consisting of two main parts. The first of these parts dealt with personal background data—age, race, marital status, and the like; the second part consisted of fifteen statements pertaining to dating and related practices and aiming at the measurement of liberalism with reference to the situations described by these statements. The subjects' responses to each of the fifteen items—for

*Paper given at the nineteenth annual meeting of the Ohio Valley Sociological Society, Columbus, Ohio, April 26, 1957. Thanks are due to Mrs. Carole Elaine Bardis for many valuable suggestions.

¹ Panos D. Bardis, "Attitudes Toward Dating Among Foreign Students in America," *Marriage and Family Living*, 18: 339-44, November 1956.

² The author is grateful to Dr. Harold T. Christensen for many useful suggestions concerning the construction of the schedule.

instance, "dating a stranger," "kissing on the first date"—were quantified by means of the following 5-point scale: 0 = never, 1 = very seldom, 2 = seldom, 3 = frequently, 4 = very frequently. In this way, by summing up a subject's fifteen numerical reactions, that is, the values representing the degree of approval concerning each of the issues, we could obtain his total liberalism score. The theoretical range of such scores was 0 (least liberal) to 60 (most liberal). Comparison of liberalism scores thus obtained was made by means of several statistical tests.

Findings and Interpretation. The group's mean responses to each of the fifteen issues were as follows—the theoretical range of responses to each issue was 0 to 4: free and independent choice of one's mate, 3.58; extent of approval of dating by society, 3.30; free and independent choice of one's dating partner, 3.25; variety of dating partners until one becomes serious, 3.22; girls wearing make-up, 3.05; dating partners unsupervised by adults (while dating), 2.42; staying out until or after midnight with one's date, 2.10; women wearing modern clothing (shorts, low-cut dresses, etc.), 2.06; girls having as many freedoms as boys (from every point of view), 1.63; girls asking boys for dates, 1.50; girls sharing dating expenses, 1.49; kissing on the first date, 1.45; dating a stranger (one you do not know well), 1.16; talking about physical love with one's date, .93; making physical love (more than kissing) while dating, .45.

The statements corresponding to means higher than 3 in general indicate that arranged marriage is no longer an accepted practice among young people and that dating is unhesitatingly recognized by them as a satisfactory type of relationship between males and females before marriage. Variety of dating partners, at least until one becomes serious, is also approved enthusiastically. The statements with means lower than 3 but higher than 2 show that adult supervision of dating activities is rejected, but with less enthusiasm. Statements represented by means lower than 2 but higher than 1 reveal that the double standard and traditional sex roles are still approved to a great extent. Finally, the means found between 0 and 1 are indicative of a high degree of disapproval of speaking to one's dating partner about physical love or engaging in physical contacts more intimate than kissing.

These attitudes presented an extensive differentiation when the mean of the males' total liberalism scores was compared with that of the females—the former was 33.26 and the latter 30.41, while the total liberalism mean for the entire sample was 31.59. An F of 1.50, with 65

and 46 degrees of freedom,³ was insignificant at the 2 per cent level, thus permitting the employment of a t-test, instead of a t' . The t for this comparison was 2.88, which, with 111 degrees of freedom, was significant at the 1 per cent level and thus indicated that the males were much more liberal than the females.

When the younger students were compared with the older ones, however, no significant difference was found. A division into those who were 16-17 years old and those aged 18-21 gave a mean of 30.92 for the former and 32.50 for the latter. The F was 1.08 and, with 47 and 64 degrees of freedom, insignificant at both the 2 per cent and 10 per cent levels. Accordingly, the t-test was employed. This resulted in a value of 1.61, which, with 111 degrees of freedom, was insignificant even at the 10 per cent level. One may conclude, therefore, that, at least in the present study, the age variable does not seem to prevent a high degree of uniformity among high school students of the same sex concerning attitudes toward dating and related practices.

Insignificant differences were also characteristic of most comparisons involving the ages at which males and females actually began to date—only two males and one female had never dated—and the ages at which each sex believed that young people should begin to date.

The males, for instance, actually began to date at a mean age of 14.18 years, while the corresponding mean for the females was 14.31. The F for these data was 1.49 and, with 44 and 64 degrees of freedom, insignificant at both the 2 per cent and 10 per cent levels. The t was .52 and, with 108 degrees of freedom, insignificant even at the 50 per cent level.

The males' mean, 14.18, was also compared with the mean age 14.15, at which these same males stated that males in general should begin to date. The t-test for this comparison gave a value of .11, which, with 88 degrees of freedom, was insignificant even at the 50 per cent level.

The mean age 14.15, at which males believed that males should begin to date, was also compared with the mean age 13.80, at which these same males said that females in general should begin to date. The t in this case was 1.67, which, with 88 degrees of freedom, was insignificant at the 5 per cent level, but significant at the 10 per cent level.

The t for the comparison of the mean age 14.31, at which females actually began to date, with the mean age 14.22, at which these same

³ The variation of the degrees of freedom in this and subsequent statistical tests is due to the varying N 's of the many subgroups compared and the fact that the numerator of the F is always the greater S^2 .

females believed that females in general should begin to date, was .43. This value, with 128 degrees of freedom, was insignificant even at the 50 per cent level.

Finally, the comparison of the mean age 14.97, at which females said that males should begin to date, with the mean age 14.22, at which these same females said that females should begin to date, resulted in a t of 2.78. This, with 128 degrees of freedom, was significant at the 1 per cent level.

The above tests led to the following conclusions:

1. Males and females began to date at about the same average age.
2. The mean age at which each group began to date did not differ significantly from that given by each as a desirable time for members of its own sex to start dating.

3. Both groups, and especially females, believed that girls should begin to date earlier than boys. Perhaps this was due to awareness of the faster physical development of women,⁴ the fact that they usually are ready for marriage sooner, and their tendency to marry men older than themselves. It is interesting to note that the female subjects displayed greater consciousness concerning these matters, since the mean difference given by them was 9 months, whereas that of the males was only 4. The latter, however, was located at a lower age level than the former. In other words, while both sexes began to date at about the same mean age of slightly more than 14 years, females would like the males' first date to be delayed, whereas males would like the females' first date to be accelerated.

Summary and Conclusions. The main conclusions were as follows: (1) Variety of dating partners and dating not involving extensive adult supervision were favored very much by the subjects, but intimate physical contacts were somewhat disapproved. (2) Female students were significantly less liberal than male students. (3) There was no significant difference between younger and older subjects. (4) Males and females began to date at about the same mean age of slightly more than 14 years, but both groups, especially the females, believed that girls in general should start dating earlier than boys. (5) Finally, the mean of the entire sample's total liberalism scores was 31.59.

⁴ Harold T. Christensen, *Marriage Analysis* (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1950), Chap. 4.

CHILDREN'S CONCEPTIONS OF OCCUPATIONAL STRATIFICATION*

EUGENE A. WEINSTEIN

Children's Bureau,

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

With the advent of rapid mass communication and transportation, commonalities in the evaluation of social positions have developed which extend beyond the local community level. Such considerations have led to theories of stratification at the community level as the reflection of a larger system of hierarchically arranged positions, namely, stratification in the mass society.¹

If such theories are to have utility, it is necessary that people have concepts of a broad general stratification system, not simply knowledge of the ranking of specific persons in the local community. This approach assumes that people meaningfully respond to an abstract system of differentially evaluated positions.

A major purpose of this study is to discover how such responses become incorporated in children's conceptions of stratification. It is assumed that they operate on the socialization process, so that children develop an awareness of stratification in the abstract. This study attempts to trace a portion of the development of children's pictures of a stratified adult world, focusing mainly on the differential evaluation of occupations. It also seeks to investigate the relationship of the child's own status background to the way he views the stratification system.

The study was carried out in the Chicago Public Elementary Schools. Two factors, school grade and status level, were systematically varied in the sampling procedure in order to assess their relationship to the children's responses. By varying school grade (highly correlated with age) it was hoped that developmental patterns in conceptions of occupational stratification might be traced. Studies by Centers, Davis and the Gard-

*Paper read at the annual meetings of the American Sociological Society, September 1956. This research is more fully described in the author's Ph.D. dissertation, "Development of Children's Conceptions of Occupational Prestige," Northwestern University, 1954. The author is grateful for the cooperation of Dr. Donald C. Rogers and the Chicago Public School System in conducting this study. The assistance of the Social Science Research Council is also gratefully acknowledged. The study was conducted as part of a Research Training Fellowship from the Council.

¹ For a summary of this position see P. Hatt, "Stratification in the Mass Society," *American Sociological Review*, 15: 216-22.

ners, Hyman, and Warner have indicated important differences among status groups in the way they perceive the stratification system.² Status level was systematically varied to determine whether these differences at the adult level are reflected in children's perceptions.³

An open-ended interview was constructed, designed to get at children's notions of a general stratification system. It consisted of ten questions, each used to get the child talking about a specific area. Additional questions were asked, following up leads obtained from the child's initial response to each item. This method was used in an attempt to minimize the danger of imposing a frame of reference on the children's responses. The interview was administered individually, and the responses tape-recorded. A system of categories was developed into which responses were coded from the tapes.

Differences in the distribution of responses to each item among status- and grade-level subsamples were analyzed by means of chi-square. All differences discussed in the following sections satisfy the 5 per cent criterion of significance.

In the first item the child is asked for his notions of the criteria by which the adult world is stratified. The most striking fact revealed in the responses to this item is the predominance of occupation as such a criterion. Occupation, either alone or in conjunction with some other factor, was mentioned by everyone in the sample. Responses such as "Their jobs," "What he does for a living," and "If it's a factory or he's a doctor or something" were frequent. A number of additional criteria were mentioned. The most frequent were income, i.e., "If they're rich or not," and life style as indicated by responses such as "If they belong to exclusive clubs and things like that." As would be expected on the basis of principles of conceptual development, the use of multiple criteria was significantly greater in the higher grades.

² R. Centers, *The Psychology of Social Classes* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1949); A. Davis, B. Gardner, and M. Gardner, *Deep South* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1941); H. Hyman, "The Value Systems of the Different Classes: A Social Psychological Contribution to the Analysis of Stratification," in R. Bendix and S. Lipset, *Class, Status, and Power*, (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1953); W. L. Warner, M. Meeker, and K. Eels, *Social Class in America* (Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1949).

³ The status level of children was defined in terms of the status level of the school they attend. This was measured by the ecological characteristics of the area from which each school draws its students. Using census tract data on income and education, an index was devised to array the schools. The schools nearest the highest, upper third, lower third, and lowest points in the array were selected as representative of upper, upper-middle, lower-middle, and lower status levels respectively. Within the four selected schools, six white male students from each of the fourth, sixth, and eighth grades were randomly selected, making a total of seventy-two students in the sample.

The child was then asked why he chose occupation as a criterion. The most frequent reasons given reflect a popular conception of what Davis and Moore call "differential functional importance."⁴ The sophistication with which this concept was expressed varied from grade level to grade level. Younger children tended to give replies such as "Some jobs is harder" and "It shows if you're a big man and do the important work." By the eighth grade, responses such as "People couldn't do without a doctor, they save lives" were typical. For some of the children, occupation was seen simply as a source of rewards: "If you have a real high job, you can make a lot of money."

The third question asked the child for examples of what he thinks are high, medium, and low occupations. The examples given for each level were assessed on the basis of their similarity to modal adult evaluations as indicated in the North-Hatt scale. As would be expected, the degree of similarity to the North-Hatt ratings increased regularly with grade level. Deviations from adult ratings occurred mostly in the examples given of high occupations. Fourth graders tended to include such occupations as policemen and firemen in their high group. By the sixth and eighth grades, most of the examples fell into the professional and proprietary categories.

The grades did not differ significantly in the examples given of medium and low jobs. Medium jobs were generally proprietary, qualified by the size of establishment, such as "Has a little store." Clerical jobs such as "Works in an office" and the teaching profession were also frequently mentioned. Low jobs fell mainly in the service and labor categories such as ditch digger and servant. Some fourth graders simply reported working conditions, such as "Dirty job."

The status groups differed in their similarity to adult evaluations. The examples given by lower status students tended to be most dissimilar to modal adult evaluations, especially for high status jobs. Their most frequent examples were in skilled labor, such as electrician and carpenter. Upper-middle students, in contrast, most frequently mentioned professions as high jobs. Examples of high jobs given by upper and by lower-middle status students fell into the managerial and proprietary groups. Upper status students focused on managerial aspects, such as "Executive of a big company," while lower-middle students emphasized proprietary aspects, such as "Owns a big store."

⁴ K. Davis and W. Moore, "Some Principles of Stratification," *American Sociological Review*, 10:242-49.

Clerical and small proprietary occupations were most frequently reported as medium jobs by children in each status group. Low jobs were mostly unskilled labor and private household service. A number of lower status students also mentioned "Part-time jobs." Exceptions to this pattern were most frequently in the upper and upper-middle students' examples. They tended to underevaluate jobs in the skilled labor category, including them along with unskilled labor and service occupations as low jobs.

In the fourth question the child is asked for his notion of the way occupational status is distributed by asking him the proportion of the population belonging to each of the three broad prestige groups. Invariably, the largest proportion was reported in medium jobs. This equating of medium and most is a familiar pattern in adult as well as children's perceptions. The responses were analyzed further to determine the shape of the perceived distribution. This was done by comparing the proportion of the population reported in high jobs with that reported in low jobs. If high was greater than low, the distribution was regarded as negatively skewed; if low was greater than high, positively skewed; and if both were about the same, symmetrical.

The status groups differed sharply in the way they perceived this distribution. Children tended to see a larger proportion of people in jobs closest to their own status background. Upper and upper-middle students saw the distribution as negatively skewed; lower and lower-middle students saw the distribution as positively skewed. Exceptions to this pattern tended to cluster in the lower grades, with the distribution seen as symmetrical.

The fifth question asked for the reasons for this distribution. Two major reasons were cited. The status distribution was seen either as a consequence of the limited distribution of opportunities ("Well, there's just so many high jobs") or as a function of the distribution of individual ability.

Ability responses indicated capacities of two kinds. One, given most frequently by upper status students, indicated intellectual capacity: "Not everybody's smart enough to get a high job." The second, given most frequently by lower status students, indicated the ability (or desire) to work hard, "Some folks is too lazy." In the fourth grade, most children gave responses indicating either opportunity or ability responses; by the sixth and eighth, they related the two.

The sixth question was designed to get at children's conceptions of the channels of mobility. Education, individual ability, and advantageous

background factors were often mentioned, usually in conjunction with some variation of the Horatio Alger tale. The factors emphasized in a particular version of the tale varied somewhat, with great weight placed on hard work by some of the lower status students. As one fourth grader put it, "You look in the paper and find a job at the plant. Then you can work real hard and the boss will like you and he'll give you a raise." As in previous items, the grade groups differed significantly in the use of multiple factors.

In the seventh question, the children were asked for the determinants of high status. As in the earlier part of the interview, responses generally indicated function, reward, or both as determinants, "Because it's harder," "It shows how intelligent you are. It takes brains to do a high job," or "You have more money." The association between grade level and the use of multiple criteria again was significant. Eighth graders were able to trace rather complex relationships between function and reward such as "Some jobs are needed more so people think they are more important. Usually they need more training so it's hard to get people who can do the job. They pay high so they can get people with the most ability."

In the eighth question, the child was asked for his conception of the types of rewards associated with high status occupations. All of the students mention material rewards of one form or another: "You can get nice things," "More money." Psychic rewards begin to be mentioned by a few sixth graders and most eighth graders. The status groups differed significantly in the frequency with which these psychic rewards are included. With the exception of those in the lower grades, most of the upper and upper-middle students mentioned psychic rewards of two kinds. The first was prestige as indicated by such responses as "More prestige" and "People look up to you." The second was similar to Warner's concept of Evaluative Participation: "Well, you get to go around with important people."

The ninth item was designed to explore one facet of Davis' distinction between prestige and esteem—the extent to which differences in the relative status of persons, based upon their occupations, can be modified by differences in the quality of their performance in those occupations.⁵

The grade groups differed significantly in their approach to this relationship. Fourth graders saw superior performance as mandatorily changing relative status; in the upper grades performance may possibly bring

⁵ K. Davis, "A Conceptual Analysis of Stratification," *American Sociological Review*, 7: 309-21.

about a change in status but not necessarily so. For some of the sixth and eighth grade students relative status is immovable regardless of performance.

The status groups also differed significantly in their conceptions. Outside of the youngest, upper and lower status children saw little possible change in relative status: "No, he's a lawyer or a doctor and he's still the highest," or "Well, if he worked the longest hours and the hardest, he might get to be up a little but it still wouldn't be higher than an electrician (high job) or something like that." The middle groups more frequently consider the possibility of change. For the upper-middle group this change is not necessarily mandatory but relates to occupational mobility: "Well, if he's the best carpenter, he could have a lot of carpenters working for him and maybe start a company. Then he might be higher than a middle president of a company." For the lower-middle group, the change is necessary, "'Cause he's the one who does the best work."

In the tenth question the child is asked why the relationship he described obtains. In the main, the reasons given were distributed in the same fashion as responses to the previous item. Children who saw a mandatory change in relative status tended to emphasize performance as the primary factor in the relationship. Children who saw no change possible tended to focus on the magnitude of the status differential. Children who believed a change possible but not necessary tended to take both factors into account.

Four conclusions may be drawn from these data. The first is that the development of conceptions of occupational stratification proceeds according to principles derived from previous studies of concept formation. This conclusion is to be qualified by the fact that the study utilized a cross-sectional rather than longitudinal design. However, within this design, responses tend to proceed from the simple to the complex as indicated by the magnitude of the grade-level chi-squares when there was a possibility of using multiple criteria. Further, analysis of the content of responses at each grade level indicated that the older children not only are aware of more factors but deal with them more abstractly and draw more complex relationships among them.

Second, previously observed differences in adult attitudes and values tend to reflect themselves in the responses of children of different status groups. It has been found that persons of lower social status place great emphasis on economic factors. Similarly, children in the two lower groups placed great emphasis on income in the examples of jobs at various levels of importance, on hard work and pay raises as a channel of upward mobility, and on material rather than psychic rewards.

It has also been pointed out that differences occur in the way the stratification system is perceived, depending on the position of the observer in the stratification system. The fineness of perceived status gradations decreases as distance in status from the observer increases. This seems to hold for children as well as adults. In their conceptions of the distribution of status, all of the children saw the medium occupations as accounting for the largest proportion of the population. However, upper and upper-middle status students thought more people were in high than in low jobs. The opposite was true for lower and lower-middle students. The same sort of mechanism seemed to be operating in the examples they gave of occupations at various levels in the status hierarchy. The two upper groups tended to lump everyone from skilled craftsmen to private household workers as having low jobs; the two lower groups included everyone from skilled craftsmen to professionals as having high jobs.

Third, the attitudes, values, and modes of perception among the status groups are so related to the developmental process that as age increases, the disparity between the status groups also increases. An analysis was made of the pattern of responses within the status groups at each grade level. The modal response category for each status group on each item was determined. Deviant responses were then distributed by grade level. The frequency of these deviations was consistently smaller as grade level increased.

Finally, children are able to respond meaningfully to situations dealing with an abstract system of stratified occupational positions having no necessary ties to specific persons or a concrete locality. Certainly all of the children do not understand the complex structure of interrelated factors out of which this system has arisen. Neither do all adults. There are levels of sophistication with which the system is perceived. However, even at the lowest level tapped here, children are at least aware that the adult world is stratified along some principle of differentially evaluating occupations.

MUKERJEE AND SOCIAL VALUES

EMORY S. BOGARDUS

University of Southern California

While many sociologists have written about social values, Radhakamal Mukerjee has gone further than most of his contemporaries in orienting the subject of values within a general theory of society. Not only has he developed a theory of values but he has presented it within a far-reaching "universe of discourse" that extends from each individual to the cosmic world.

This treatment of Mukerjee's system of social thought emphasizes the contributions of an outstanding Oriental sociologist and social philosopher. The social thought of the early Hebrew, East Indian, Chinese, and related thinkers of the East was the product of the mental activities of individuals representing one or another of important culture areas of Asia, but the discussion of social values by Mukerjee represents to a notable degree a social system that is not only representative of both East and West, but that is the result of an integration of Eastern and Western social thought viewed in the light of an over-all cosmic order.

Mukerjee was born in 1889 in India. His father was an Indian lawyer, and he grew to manhood in a house filled with books from both the East and the West, and where his older brothers were "humming over books." He was well grounded in Indian social philosophy, but his education did not stop there. He studied history with deep interest, but he reports that "the face-to-face contact with misery, squalor, and degradation in the slums of Calcutta decided my future interest in economics and sociology."¹ He early acquired practical experience in the adult evening schools that he set up as early as 1906 and in which he has maintained a lifelong participation. He has also maintained continued contact with social welfare work of various kinds, including rural credit societies and other types of village cooperatives.

Another important background in Mukerjee's analysis of values is his understanding of mysticism.² At this point he brings to bear a basic Oriental approach to the study of values that many Western thinkers

¹ Baljit Singh, editor, *The Frontiers of Social Science* (London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1956), p. 4.

² See his *Theory and Art of Mysticism* (New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1937).

tend to ignore. To this "primary and indispensable sympathy," as Hocking points out, Mukerjee adds "a threefold objectivity: that of the scholar scientifically trained, that of the reader widely familiar with Western literature on his subject, and that of the sociologist concerned with the bearing of religion upon the health of human institutions."³

The role of Oriental and especially Indian mysticism in an understanding of social values is indicated by Mukerjee, who rejects the escapist theory about mysticism and indicates that it effects a quieting of the mind, it develops "an ethical neutrality," it provides "a searching self-analysis, a strenuous and patient self-discipline and an ultimate self-transcendence," it produces "a freedom from all contingencies and references, even from the accidents of life and death"; in short, it posits the common man as the universal man, and it sees the universal man as "the true, eternal expression for human freedom and equality, for justice and goodness in all human relations and institutions, and for sharing, service and solidarity of all groups and classes . . . Between mysticism and society there is a reciprocity which has an end."⁴ True mysticism, according to Mukerjee, "discovers a configuration of the self, expanding its circumference indefinitely, establishing itself as the center of the world of values."⁵

Mukerjee pays tribute to the influence on his thinking of Professor Benay Kuman Sarkar, "a man of great sacrifice and idealism," interested in social education and in the rehabilitation of the rural village life. This contact was made more real by a visit to south India, "still the home of the self-governing village," where Mukerjee's concepts of regionalism and social ecology began to take shape.⁶ In later years, Robert E. Park visited Mukerjee in India and brought a new emphasis on community studies. E. A. Ross was another visitor who was impressed by Mukerjee's studies of regionalism. Mukerjee in recent years visited a number of American universities and profited by contacts in the United States with Park and Ross; earlier, Mukerjee had been a careful student of the writings of Ward and Giddings, as well as of Comte, Spencer, Bagehot, Hobhouse, Ricardo, Mill, Marshall. Thus, it is seen that Mukerjee's thinking represents an unusual combination of Eastern and Western thought. Perhaps no other sociologist has been so fortunate in the breadth of his mental contacts and in his approach to the interpretation of human values.

³ W. E. Hocking in B. Singh, *op. cit.*, p. 409.

⁴ Mukerjee in B. Singh, *op. cit.*, pp. 12, 13.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 6, 9.

This paper is stimulated by the recent appearance of a volume issued "in honor of Radhakamal Mukerjee" and also a summary of "A General Theory of Society" by Mukerjee.⁷ These two papers bring Mukerjee's social thinking up to date and are invaluable sources for this discussion of his contribution to an analysis of social values.

I

Mukerjee's theory of social value is based in part on his thinking regarding regionalism and ecology, prompted in part by studies in south India and in part by a study of the proposals of Patrick Geddes, who visited India in 1914 and 1915. Mukerjee was influenced by the ideas not only of Park but also of Lewis Mumford, as well as of Odum. He accepts the concept of "natural region" but claims that Park, McKenzie, Burgers, and others "do not give adequate consideration to the unity of region built up by social habits, traditions, and values."⁸ He agrees with Odum's emphasis on social-psychological factors in the latter's discussion of "folk regionalism!" He conceives of the region "as an intricate network of interrelations" and as exhibiting "a complex pattern of adaptations between the environmental factors and the plant and animal communities including human societies."⁹ Mukerjee proclaims the region as an "ecological aggregate of persons," "an economic framework and a cultural order," a coordinate set of stimuli, eliciting a similarity of responses, habits, and feelings that are molded into a "characteristic neutral type and pattern of living"; hence, "the fundamental unit of study for sociology is the region."¹⁰

In regional research Mukerjee found the social sciences to have a basic relation in common. In studies of regions "the walls which keep the different social sciences in watertight compartments crumble down."¹¹ Mukerjee, after coming to the faculty of the University of Lucknow in 1921, introduced "an integrated approach in economics, sociology, and anthropology."¹²

In his studies of regions Mukerjee found a regional balancing of the different forces at work. One study of this regional balance he called

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 3-74.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

⁹ Mukerjee, *The Regional Balance of Man* (Madras: University of Madras, 1938), Introduction, p. 1.

¹⁰ Mukerjee, *Social Ecology* (New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1945), p. viii.

¹¹ "Foreword," *Indian Sociological Review*, August 1923.

¹² Mukerjee in B. Singh, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

social ecology, which he defined as "a synoptic study of the balance of plant, animal, and human communities, which are systems of correlated working parts in the organization of the region."¹³ Human ecology considers human communities as an integral part of the organization of all life in a region, plant, animal, and human.¹⁴ It has three tasks. One is "to trace the adaptations of interacting human beings and of inter-related human institutions to the region, including in the latter term not merely soil, climate, and land form, but also plant and animal communities." A second task is to investigate "the spatial and food relations in which human beings and activities are organized in a natural area in terms of the ensemble of ecologic forces." The third task is "to measure the balances and mutual pressures of human, along with other living and nonliving communities in the region and discover whether these prove favorable or unfavorable for man's dominance and permanence."¹⁵

According to Mukerjee, it is necessary for man in order to control nature to follow nature, for "she has her own wisdom." It is not wise for man seriously to disturb "the balance and rhythm in which nature delights," or vengeance may follow quickly.¹⁶ Mukerjee develops the concept of "applied ecology" as well as of "synecology." The former envisages man's manifold development as being "in harmony with the ecologic balance of population and resources as well as of vegetation and animal life."¹⁷ The latter is ecology working in cooperation with human geography, human biology, economics, social psychology and technics.¹⁸ Man lives in a multidimensional environment, that is, "in the ecological area, in the institution, in the class, in the state, in the communion (of people), and at the same time internalizes the region, the institution, the class, the state, and community."¹⁹ Mukerjee's theory of social values emerges from interactions involved in man's multidimensional environment.²⁰

¹³ Mukerjee, *Regional Sociology* (New York: The Century Company, 1926), p. vi.

¹⁴ Mukerjee, "The Concepts of Balance and Organization of Social Ecology," *Sociology and Social Research*, XVI: 504.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 505.

¹⁶ Mukerjee, "The Broken Balance of Man and Region," *Sociology and Social Research*, XVII: 407.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 408.

¹⁸ Mukerjee in B. Singh, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 30.

²⁰ James A. Quinn credits Mukerjee with having published "the first constructive, systematic theoretical book on social ecology" (in B. Singh, *ibid.*, p. 267). Although Park, Burgess, and McKenzie made basic contributions earlier and Bews and Alihan published books on certain aspects of ecology before Mukerjee's *Social Ecology* appeared (New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1945), he was the first to "systematize constructively the theoretical concepts and principles of social ecology."

II

Out of his multidimensional environment man develops "values and symbols," which are synthetic products of the human mind that enhance, elevate, and refine social relations and processes and "bind men together in ever-expanding ever-deepening participation and communication."²¹ Values are defined as "socially approved desires and goals that are internalized through the process of conditioning, learning, or socialization and that become subjective preferences, standards, and aspirations," and society is "an organization and accumulation of values." There is a hierarchy of values ranging from "immediate, specific, and instrumental to ideal, universal, and intrinsic values."²²

Values have an "absolutism" which is "an embodiment of the universal human craving for order and harmony," and "with his values man actualizes his desires and goals with zest and persistence." "Values can be inferred from the manner in which man spends his time, income, and energies." The patterns of social life, relations, and institutions emerge from the "differentiation and the hierarchy of normal value experience."²³

By their nature "all human relations and behavior" are values. Values play an important role in the integration and fulfillment of man's basic impulses and desires "in a stable and consistent manner appropriate for his social living." They are "generic experiences in social action made up of both individual and social responses and attitudes." They build up societies, integrate social relations, "mould the ideal dimensions of personality and the range and depth of culture."²⁴

Values have "condensed epitomised expressions," namely, symbols. A symbol may be defined as "a vehicle of communication and regulation of human relations, a pregnant, epitomised expression of meanings and values shared in human life." Human relations are largely symbolic; man "competes and struggles with fellowmen even for sex, food, and living space symbolically." Symbols bring one nearer than values not only to the experiences of individuals, but as vehicles of "communication, stratification, and control are also more amenable to scientific, objective analysis."²⁵ Symbols make a part of the values of life "visible by patterning and stereotyping these," and hence make it possible for man to understand and experience these values.²⁶

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 23.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 35, 53.

²⁶ Mukerjee, *The Social Structure of Values* (London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1949), p. 183.

A gradation of values is found in four basic types of social integration. (1) In the crowd there may be an outburst of moral feeling that aims to correct some act adjudged to be wrong, but by brutal force. (2) In the economic interest group, certain elemental values may be expressed, such as reciprocity, integrity, consideration, fairness. There may be "individual assertion and reciprocal service" or "impersonal conflict and retaliation."²⁷ (3) In "society" or "community," equity and justice find expression. (4) In "commonality" the chief values are "spontaneous love," social responsibility, solidarity, and cooperativeness. It is values such as these that "can alone supply the sure moral foundation of world reconstruction of the future."²⁸ At this high value level, life is shared. The human person ascends "from the superficial, egotistic, and evanescent self to the deep, altruistic, and universal self."²⁹

Disvalues as well as values are found "in all dimensions of behavior." On the personality side of life there are lapses, denials, and perversions of values. These are accompanied by "a sense of guilt, shame and loss of self-esteem or self-status." On the societary side there are "disharmonious haphazard, inequitous, and exploitative social relations and anti-social group formations."³⁰ Disvalues have their origins "in the lack of coherence or dissociation between the biological, the social, and the ideal phases of human satisfaction." They are expressed in institutions which "evade laws and social codes."³¹ Mukerjee's emphasis is on the side of treatment of disvalues. He would reintegrate deviant individuals and groups by working on the total social situation and on the social adaptability of persons and groups.³²

Mukerjee distinguishes between goals, ideals, normative ideals, and values. Out of man's basic needs and tensions goals arise and are selected to meet needs and reduce tensions. But goals become competitive and it is necessary to select the best or the ideal. Ideals, however, are at first incomplete and do not give "stability, harmony, and coherence, which may be secured by means of norms (normative ideals) which are imperative." "Norms incarnate man's strivings and aspirations for self-realization and growth that his life and his society present."³³ Norms become

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 119.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 189.

²⁹ Mukerjee, *The Dynamics of Morals* (London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1950), pp. 407-08.

³⁰ Mukerjee in B. Singh, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

³¹ S. Chandra in B. Singh, *op. cit.*, p. 504.

³² *Ibid.*

³³ Mukerjee in B. Singh, *op. cit.*, p. 66.

values when they are internalized as man's "conscience and faith, and projected in his concrete social relations and institutions, in his freedoms, laws and rights, and duties."³⁴ In Oriental culture, norms and values constitute both man's "deepest self and the essence of an eternal, spiritual, teleological order of the cosmos."³⁵

III

Values and value systems "define and govern the structure of personality," and personality, in turn, "seeks a qualitative refinement and enrichment of his value insight and experience." In so doing, a person conserves and maximizes "values without which he cannot find harmony with himself and society." This "reciprocity between the person and environment via community keeps values ever changing, lapsing, or augmenting."³⁶

Personality ranges from "the superficial, egoistic, and evanescent to the deep, altruistic, and universal self."³⁷ The command "Love thy neighbor as thyself" really means "Love thy neighbor as thyself because in essence thou art thy neighbor." It is possible for a person to lead society toward that full harmony and perfect concord which he obtains from his experience of God, "for God is the supreme good."³⁸ Man possesses a superiority over society and nature, as "shown by the world of values which his philosophy creates and his religion makes dynamic in his heart."³⁹

The person passes from one level of behavior to another. There are three main dimensions (levels) of behavior within which an individual finds expression "in the improvement of his social relations, the enrichment of values and personality, as well as of his moral life." The first dimension is the biosocial. A person prepares himself for living in society by learning "to obey coercive rules and regulations that arise out of the constant threat and pressure of the external environment and the inadequacy of his nature." The second dimension is that of psychic integration in society. For his inner growth and fulfillment, he "must live in harmony and intimacy with fellowmen." The third dimension is the spiritual, wherein a person may achieve self-poise and competence by achieving a rapport with the cosmic order and God (spiritual at-homeness).⁴⁰

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 67.

³⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 417.

³⁸ Mukerjee, *Theory and Art of Mysticism*, p. 3.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 221.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 38, 39.

A person develops prudence in his biosocial environment, loyalty in his social-psychic environment, and reverence in his spiritual environment. There are "no social relations that are not moral" and no spiritual relations that are not reverent. There is more than a passing relationship between Mukerjee's emphasis on "reverence" and Schweitzer's concept of "reverence for life."⁴¹

The moral progress of the person "builds up and communicates itself in reverence." Reverence "proclaims the majesty and dignity of the common man." It seems to guard, integrate, and order "the varied social relations and goals" of life, and it provides "the true meaning of man's social nature and values and the staying-power for a wholeness and integrity in self, society, and cosmos."⁴²

"A society in order to persist must regularly fulfill the supreme values of personality." This statement suggests why great civilizations have fallen, and it suggests why some current civilizations may not long survive. They will rise or fall according to their emphasis on personality development.⁴³ It is suggested that civilization needs a social science theory "of full and integrated personality and of free and universal society."⁴⁴ The highest search of personality is for "higher spiritual values of beauty, goodness and love," for the creation and re-creation of social relations and institutions based on beauty, goodness, and love. An enduring world order calls for an appreciation of the continuity between personality and universe, between the social order and the cosmic order. In no other way is it possible to unite mankind and save beauty, goodness, and love.⁴⁵

IV

On the basis of social value systems as created, developed, and changed by persons, Mukerjee develops a general theory of society. To attain this theory he calls for a close integration of the social sciences. He deplores the development in the past of the different social sciences in watertight compartments. Only through the close collaboration of the sciences of life, of the mind, and of society can a general theory of society be sound-

⁴¹ Albert Schweitzer, *Out of Life and Naught* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1949), pp. 185.

⁴² Mukerjee in B. Singh, *op. cit.*, p. 39.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 46.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 73.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 73, 74.

ly based and developed. Society "is not divisible," and an understanding of it can be obtained only from studying "the habits, values, and symbols of society as a totality."⁴⁶

Society is "the sum of the structures and functions through which man orients himself to the three dimensions or levels of his environment, ecologic, psychosocial, and telic-moral." In so doing he "fulfils his basic requirements of sustenance, status, and value-fulfilment,"⁴⁷ according to the three moral levels of prudence, loyalty, and reverence. In the ecologic world, a balance and rhythm of growth takes place for all; in the psychosocial world, a kind of balance or equilibrium occurs for all the institutions and the culture found therein. Here culture becomes the guardian that assures a true equilibrium not merely "between different institutions" but also "between the divergent statuses, expectancies, and values of man."⁴⁸ Culture is defined by Mukerjee as "the aggregate of beliefs, values, and behaviors of the members of a society and the aggregate of symbols which express and communicate such beliefs, values, and behaviors."⁴⁹ In the telic-moral and spiritual world an equilibrium occurs between all the values functioning therein.

Mukerjee's general theory of society considers society as an "open system," which means "an essentially self-directed and active organization that tends toward increased heterogeneity, wholeness, and macroscopic orderliness." It involves "the uniqueness" of each person's "feelings, emotions, and learned trends." It is this uniqueness of each personality "that continually renews culture and changes its course."⁵⁰ "Social structure and functions comprise an expanding universe of symbols, eidos, and ethos." Social evolution moves from the "immediate, specific, and instrumental to ideal, universal, and intrinsic values."⁵¹

Social controls are necessary if a society is to maintain its identity and self-sufficiency. Hence, society "prevents and regulates conflicts of groups and individuals." It uses physical restraint and coercion to safeguard its status-power-prestige system. It uses laws to see that values are "protected and shared and at the same time are scaled and ordered." The personal interiorization of values through experience becomes the chief means of control.

Mukerjee adopts the "field" concept because it is "interactional, emphasizing dynamics within a unified system and self-direction toward a

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 11, 19.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 33.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 31.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 31, 32.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 62.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

specific coordinated unity of structure and activities."⁵² He repudiates a "closed system" of society, a naturalistic philosophy, and dialectical materialism. He develops social optima and population optima for the different dimensions of society. The essence of his general theory of society is "the identification of the way to individual perfection with the general progress of society and humanity in terms of values and ideals exercised in rational direction and control."⁵³

V

Mukerjee envisages a master science of society. It includes "the human ecological theory, the sociological theory, and the theory of values and symbols" with each standing on its own footing, with each borrowing from and lending to the others." Together they form what may be called a macroscopic "general theory of society," that unites the various social sciences and "fills the gaps between the various islands of theoretical knowledge."⁵⁴ It is broader "than the science of sociology itself."⁵⁵

The science of sociology is defined by Mukerjee as "an aspect of the general theory of society which is connected with the social relationships of communication and status within the frame-work institutions."⁵⁶ Sociology deals with the fundamental complementary status relationships between persons, such as kinship, reciprocity, dominance, deference, distance, proximity, competition and cooperation within the communicative structure of the institutions of society.⁵⁷ It is the function of sociology "to cultivate a dispassionate, objective attitude" toward values without viewing present values as sacrosanct, and "to seek to explore and analyze emerging values and validate all values, new and old, with reference to the social situation, need, and experience."⁵⁸

A unity of the social sciences is pointed out by Mukerjee. Such a unity is needed to speak for "the reality of the manifold human relations as life expressions, as discoveries of, and strivings toward greater fullness and richness of value experience and clarity of meaning in man's ever-expanding life."⁵⁹ But today a social science theory is needed "of full and integrated personality and of free and universal society."

⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 63.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 52.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 56.

⁵⁵ Talcott Parsons, "The Position of Sociological Theory," *American Sociological Review*, 13:156 ff.

⁵⁶ Mukerjee in B. Singh, *op. cit.*, p. 27.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 66.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 41.

There is "a unity of human nature which transcends ethical and cultural relativity and binds mankind in a teleological world order." There is "a continuity and solidarity between man and universe, between the social order and the cosmic order" that must be recognized before there will be "any possibility of uniting mankind."⁶⁰ A scientific humanism is not enough, for it cannot arouse "flagging human enthusiasms without these latter being oriented and channeled in an infinite, super-human, super-social frame of reference."⁶¹

There is need for a master science of society, for "the great unanswered questions of mankind" are those which a master social science might be expected to answer. It will include more than sociology, although the field of sociology is developing to include "the sociology of knowledge, the sociology of values, the sociology of symbols, the sociology of arts, and the sociology of religion."⁶² All these fields "have just begun to be assiduously tilled."

A master science of society will be "global in its outlook"; it will tackle "the problems of world community"; it will respect "the common values of mankind, even when revealed in diverse schemes of life in different countries and epochs." It will include a philosophy that will "examine and reconstruct the pre-suppositions underlying the various social sciences" in the context of changing social-environmental relations and values. It will sustain "self-correcting methods."⁶³

This master science of society will tackle the problems of how "to obtain solidarity, security, freedom, poise, and sharing." It will clarify "the relations between the social and ethical spheres of human relations." It will define the processes by which the ideal values of a particular culture are reshaped or destroyed by technology and diffused widely or circumscribed narrowly by the class system and status-power structure."⁶⁴

This master science of society will aid man in his search "for higher spiritual values of beauty, goodness, and love." It will recognize "the unity of human nature which transcends ethical and cultural relations and binds mankind in a teleological world order." It will be rooted in a recognition of "the continuity and solidarity between man and nature, between the social order and the cosmic order," and thus be able to assist "in uniting mankind and saving goodness, charity, and peace for the world."⁶⁵ It will recognize God as the perennial symbol of the unity

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 73, 74.

⁶¹ *The Dynamics of Morals*, p. 428.

⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 70.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 72.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 73, 74.

of truth, beauty, and goodness coalesced with "wholeness" or holiness. It will recognize that "God dwells in the heart of every finite creature and leads mankind steadily and steadfastly to universal freedom and perfection."

The master science of human society will accept "the belief that the indwelling of God engenders an intense love, sharing, and compassion of humble, sensitive, and worshipful spirit. . . and leads to the identity of the ends of society, religion, and metaphysics."⁶⁶ It accepts the idea that religion is faith in the "permanence of values." Man is "much greater than society or nature" as shown by "the world of values that his philosophy creates and his religion makes dynamic in his heart."⁶⁷

A general theory of society will include "an indispensable place for both empirical and scientific view points on one hand, and the philosophical and artistic on the other hand." Values can be controlled by the relative constancies in human nature and revealed by symbols.⁶⁸ Social philosophy may "bridge the gulf between biological and moral man and society" and between the philosophy of science and the science of values.⁶⁹

A general theory of society utilizes great art, for it is "the great binder." The great arts of the world "immortalize the collective visions and values of historical cultures and the essential oneness of mankind." Great art reveals "the perfectibility of man," and "the enduring essence of society that transcends the barriers of class, race, or epoch."⁷⁰ The culmination of art is found in music, which is "the only adequate, final, and impeccable utterance of man's unutterable ecstasy of concord of Being and Becoming."⁷¹

Mukerjee's social thought has a universal tone. It is both humanly universal and cosmically universal. It brings the social sciences into one functioning unit of study and research and application. It brings the science of sociology and philosophy of science together. Moreover, it views all races and peoples as one. It considers each individual and human society as one. It envisages one world community. It makes values supreme in the human universe and the human universe an aspect of the cosmic purposeful universe.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

⁶⁷ *Theory and Art of Mysticism*, p. 423.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 176.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 394, 405.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 398.

PACIFIC SOCIOLOGICAL NEWS

Arizona State College. A Department of Sociology and Anthropology has been formed in the Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences of the College of Liberal Arts. Lester S. Perril, formerly chairman of the Department of Sociology at Drake University, has joined the department as professor and chairman. Clarence R. Jeffery has been appointed assistant professor. Carolyn Staats is lecturing part-time in the department. Other members of the department include Kenneth M. Stewart, Fred B. Lindstrom, and Naomi M. Harward.

University of California, Berkeley. Herbert Blumer has completed an inventory of research in the field of race relations which was commissioned by UNESCO. Kingsley Davis has returned to the university after a year at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences. Wolfram Eberhard has just returned from a year and a half in Pakistan, where he has been engaged in the study of village social organization under a grant from the Asia Foundation. Erving Goffman is joining the department in February 1958. Tamotsu Shibutani, on leave of absence during 1957-58, has completed a study of rumor and is finishing a study of ethnic segregation and military morale. During 1957-58 Lewis Coser and Nathan Glazer have been serving as visiting members of the department.

University of California, Davis. The Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Geography is now in the second year of its separate existence. It offers a combined major in sociology and anthropology. Kenneth Thompson has published several articles on the Fens area in England and is currently doing research on the Sacramento Port. David Olmsted spent five months of the summer and fall doing work in southern Oaxaca, Mexico. He is serving his second year of a three-year Social Science Research Council fellowship grant. Herbert Aarons has been appointed acting instructor of sociology. Edwin Lemert was granted \$4,500 by the Alcoholic Rehabilitation Division of the California State Department of Public Health for research on alcoholism and the family. John McNamara is serving as research sociologist on this project.

Long Beach State College. William E. Hartman, George W. Korber, and Nick Massaro have been promoted to the rank of associate professor. David L. Wolfe has joined the staff as assistant professor of sociology. Henry Zentner is now serving as chairman of the department.

Pomona College. Charles Leslie has completed his dissertation in anthropology at the University of Chicago. Alvin H. Scaff has been named editor of the *Alpha Kappa Deltan*.

San Francisco State College. Don C. Gibbons has been appointed to the Department of Sociology. He formerly taught at the University of Washington and the University of British Columbia.

University of Southern California. Emory S. Bogardus presented a lecture to members of Alpha Kappa Delta on February 14. His topic was "Are Racial Relations in the United States Improving?" (based on three decades of social distance studies).

Whittier College. A chapter of Alpha Kappa Delta was installed February 14 with a banquet and initiation of charter members by National President M. H. Neumeyer, assisted by E. S. Bogardus of the Alpha chapter of the University of Southern California. Dr. Robert O'Brien is the faculty sponsor and adviser.

SOCIAL PROBLEMS AND WELFARE

SOVIET EDUCATION FOR SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY. By Alexander G. Korol. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., copyright by The Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1957, pp. xxviii+513.

This book may have the answers to many questions of persons who have become greatly concerned about the nature and purposes of education in contemporary Russia. In its direct approach, the appraisal is based on the materials actually used in Soviet schools, so that comparisons may be made with relevant fields in American education. Soviet textbooks, examinations, syllabi, and curricula at different levels of the educational system have been examined thoroughly, though at the same time special attention has been given to physics and mechanical engineering.

More indirectly, the quality of education in the Soviet Union has been evaluated in terms of the system as a whole. The author has organized his analysis so as to account for general education through the secondary level, the ten-year school which is the counterpart of the American twelve-grade system, and the various forms of subprofessional technical training. Graduate training is given its due share of consideration. This report will no doubt be regarded as authoritative in its field.

J.E.N.

NATIONAL COMMUNISM AND SOVIET STRATEGY. By D. A. Tomasic. Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1957, pp. x+222.

In this work, Titoism is examined not only as a political and historical phenomenon but as a factor in Soviet strategy. That National Communism is not limited to Yugoslavia has recently been demonstrated in Hungary and Poland, and the issue of national independence in these and other satellites is far from settled. In the long run, according to this interpretation, it remains to be seen whether Moscow or Tito is to become the authoritative source of Communist dogma. Possibly the failure of Titoist policies may be the significant criterion of the failure of Communism as a unified world movement. The answer is not yet apparent, though Tomasic has given some good leads.

J.E.N.

GRASS ROOTS PRIVATE WELFARE. Alfred de Grazia, editor. Washington Square, New York: New York University Press, 1957, pp. xiv+306.

This book contains the essays of thirty award-winning contestants and nineteen other papers selected for publication by the Foundation for Voluntary Welfare, a nonprofit corporation of California, submitted in a National Awards Competition conducted by the Foundation. The contest grew out of the conviction that "contemporary philosophy of social welfare" needed reassessment as to its goals and techniques and was designed to discover those welfare activities which might strengthen private and voluntary welfare in America.

The fields included mental health, alcoholism, juvenile delinquency, neighborhood rehabilitation, the deaf, the crippled, the blind, chronic illness, health education and medical care, migrant workers, child welfare and aid to mothers, the aging, recreation, special financial methods, and the general spirit of voluntarism. The last section included an analysis of "Social Work Theory in the National Awards Competition" and was written by Dr. Alfred de Grazia, editor of the book, president of the Foundation for Voluntary Welfare, and a political scientist at Stanford University. It was based upon a study of 458 essays.

The authors represented 40 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and Canada, and rural areas, small towns, and cities, though 56 per cent of the essay writers came from cities of a half million or more. About half of the authors worked in private welfare agencies, about 40 per cent were employed in public agencies, and fewer than 20 per cent were unpaid volunteers. Many more women than men submitted papers

in the contest. The practicality of 458 projects was evaluated as follows: "practical," 392; "practical but difficult," 53; "of dubious practicality," 2. None were regarded as "very impractical." Eleven were not evaluated.

The reviewer is impressed by the wide range of projects but even more by the sound principles of organization and procedure, including techniques, which were followed in actual instances of community organization "at the grass roots," and indicated in the proposed projects. This book has much to offer the professional social worker, either in private or in public welfare activities. The principles are not new, but their reaffirmation and relationship to actual practice are heartening. The value of the volunteer, of local leadership, of careful study and analysis so that projects are pertinent to the situation and the recognition that each community has its own peculiar set of resources and problems are here presented in new and attractive settings. The book may well be read by professional social workers, by board and committee members, and by every citizen who is concerned about his community and desirous of being of real service.

B.A.MCC.

THE COOPERATIVE ORGANIZATION OF CONSUMERS. And Its Relation to Producer and Public Organizations. By E. R. Bowen. Chicago: The Cooperative League of the U.S.A., 1957, pp. 87.

This booklet is complementary to the author's earlier treatise entitled *The Cooperative Road to Abundance*. Its primary purpose is "to create consumer mindedness." It holds that "consumer functions are primary to our producer functions," that is, if goods were never consumed the productions of such goods would soon cease.

The following topics are given in the chapter headings: consumers all, consumers first, why organize as consumers, how organize as consumers, consumer cooperatives and producer organizations, consumer cooperatives and public organizations, national and international consumers cooperative developments, and life in a cooperative community. These themes indicate how the author has strongly stressed the importance of the consumer in a nation's economy, and the democratic role of consumer cooperatives. He considers democracy and cooperation as being correlative terms and as closely synonymous "in their meanings and will." He points out how cooperatives "have put a stop to speculative-gambling in their securities." He distinguishes between ultimate consumers, or those who consume economic goods directly, and intermediate consumers, or those who purchase goods to be used in production of goods to be consumed.

The author analyzes four types of consumer cooperatives, namely, "commodity, finance, services, and utilities," and shows how consumer cooperatives are organized on "a democratic-decentralist basis." He has succeeded in "creating consumer mindedness," and his treatise will serve well as a guide for discussion groups interested in consumers (who are everybody) and what they can do to improve both their economic conditions and their social status, as well as to contribute to the well-being of their nation and the world.

E.S.B.

FADS AND FALLACIES IN THE NAME OF SCIENCE. By Martin Gardner. New York: Dover Publications, 1957, pp. x+363.

This is a revised and expanded edition of a 1952 book called *In the Name of Science*. It is devoted, both wittily and seriously, to the exposing of the fads, myths, and fallacies which have at one time or another been celebrated for attaining some kind of scientific stature. What is significant about the whole rehearsal of such phenomena as flying saucers, Bridey Murphy, orgonomy, dianetics, and their ilk is the panoramic view that is obtained of human gullibility. The whole is a mighty good account of the power of suggestion clothed with the will to believe the miraculous or even the impossible. The author reveals rather well the implications of what he calls "systematized vagaries." The accounts of the various cults and persons sponsoring the host of superstitions and myths are vividly presented. The book might well have been entitled *Science Beware!*

M.J.V.

VOLUNTARY SOCIETIES AND SOCIAL POLICY. By Madeline Roof. New York: The Humanities Press, Inc., 1957, pp. xiii+320.

Beginning with a brief account of the development of Poor Law administration during the preceding centuries, this book presents the interrelations of voluntary societies and statutory organizations in the present century in England. The laissez-faire philosophy of former years prevented genuinely humane methods of philanthropy from operating. Not until churches and socially minded individuals demanded improved methods was progress made. Even the Charity Organization Society, founded in 1869 in London, retained for many years the rigidities imposed by the unfriendly Poor Laws. Individuals and families were merely cases and not personalities or human beings. Gradually, however, instead of imposing a program of action on a client, it planned a course of action with his cooperation. Finally, it imported some Americans to train its social workers for more efficient service.

This study gives special consideration to the three following fields of social work: (1) the maternity and child welfare movement, (2) the mental health services, (3) the welfare of the blind. In each of these fields the voluntary societies supplemented the work of the statutory agencies and pioneered in promoting newer methods of service. Frequently also contributions or subsidies were obtained from local or national public agencies. Furthermore, they recommended the enlargement and improvement of the existing laws. In spite of the valiant work of the Webbs, Britain was slow in ridding itself of the fixed and bloodless laws that had hampered the genesis of a genuine social welfare program such as that envisioned by the later Beveridge Report.

The author found that private voluntary agencies are still necessary. They possess an elasticity of program and action impossible to governmental agencies. Consequently, they are able to suggest new methods and extended services and at the same time cooperate successfully with existing agencies.

This detailed investigation of the actual relation of volunteer agencies with statutory bodies reveals facts and circumstances that heretofore were not appreciated by the public. The book would be more easily read if a repetition of titles had occasionally been made, as the constant use of initials only is somewhat confusing, especially to readers other than social workers. On the whole, this book is enlightening to both social workers and average readers.

G.B.M.

EDUCATION IN THE USSR. By The Division of International Education, International Educational Relations Branch. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1957, pp. xiv+226.

This is one of a series of studies on education in other countries. The study is based on official documentation and other primary resources, and reflects the political, economic, social, and cultural setting of Soviet Russia. Attention is given to the nature of the land and its people, before considering the planning for education and its administration; then attention is given developmentally to the functions, organization, and curriculum of primary and secondary education, to extracurricular work-activities, vocational training, semiprofessional training, and, finally, to higher education. A subject of major interest is, of course, the training of teachers. Many tables and illustrations are included. The report is realistic and objective throughout, and is in no sense speculative or biased. It should therefore meet a definite need for those who want to know what Soviet education has been planned to accomplish.

J.E.N.

AT THE APPROACH OF NINETY. By Rockwell D. Hunt. Stockton: Harvey E. Scudder, Printer of Stockton, 1957.

In this attractively printed and superbly written brochure, the author—a distinguished educator, university dean, author and historian, and a native son of California—reviews the fourscore and ten years of his life in terms of the intimate yet profound meanings of some of his significant experiences. At ninety he can say that it is “wonderful to be young” and he can “still rejoice in the spirit of youth.” Many important sidelights are thrown on the inner meanings of personality and indirectly of leadership too.

The student of gerontology will find valuable material in this delightfully written document. The author has found a happy adjustment in the years after retirement, or in his case after three successive retirements, by keeping himself “productively busy and alert to many interests,” by having “on hand more projects than I could hope to bring to completion,” by keeping acquired knowledge “in a fluid condition,” by keeping hate or bitterness out of his life, by maintaining certain moral convictions, by a humble religious faith “in an all-wise Creator and a beneficent Will of the universe,” and by striving to maintain a well-rounded personality.

E.S.B.

PEOPLES AND CULTURE

RACIAL FACTORS AND URBAN LAW ENFORCEMENT. By William M. Kephart. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1957, pp. 209.

This survey was undertaken to learn something about the integration of Negroes into the Philadelphia Police Department. It was hoped that what would be found out about race relations within the Philadelphia police force would aid the administration in its formation of policy, and that the findings would also be of value to police departments in other cities.

Numerous interviews, as well as questionnaires, brought to light the views concerning relations between Negro and white police from the standpoint of administration, command, and other personnel relationships and functions. Among other findings, it became evident that the more a white patrolman works with Negro policemen, the more likely his opinions will become favorable to the Negro policemen and the more considerate will be his treatment of Negro offenders. On the other hand, white policemen who are anti-Negro tend to project such attitudes in the community.

The report objectifies other factors in racial opposition which are bound to come to the attention of law enforcement officers, but it is apparent that sincere efforts toward reasonable adjustments are being rewarded. A basic negative influence in the Philadelphia situation has been the Negro press, which generally has been biased and hampers the program of the Police Department.

J.E.N.

SOCIAL PROCESS IN HAWAII. By Darrow Aiona, Editor. Honolulu: Romanzo Adams Social Research Laboratory and the Sociology Club, University of Hawaii.

In this 21st volume of *Social Process in Hawaii* a group of eleven related articles on racial and cultural relations and social changes in Hawaii's half-million population are presented by faculty members and advanced students in sociology of the University of Hawaii. Bernard L. Hormann finds that integration of an unusual variety of racial elements has been taking place naturally, that is, with a minimum of conflict, in a relatively small community. The author suggests that the integration process which has happened "so naturally in small Hawaii" is perhaps happening "more slowly, more painfully, in the nation and in the world at large."

Regarding racial bloc voting in Hawaii Andrew W. Lind reports that "racial bloc voting in the Mainland sense, of the rigorous control over an entire block of voters of a common race, does not occur in Hawaii." Moreover, in "the more restricted sense of voting exclusively for members of one's own ethnic group," racial bloc voting in Hawaii "is so slight as to be inconsequential." After analyzing the "ethnic factors in Oahu's 1954 general election," John M. Digman finds that "the chief determiner of the vote in elections on Oahu is, apparently, voter preference for one party rather than the other," although ethnic considerations are "of considerable importance."

An interesting study in change in ethnic attitudes by an American wife while living for a term of years in Hawaii is described by Evie K. Booth. The rather natural way that integration of white and Negro soldiers takes place in the U.S. Army is described by Chris M. Kimura. It appeared that in the case of a soldier of Oriental background in the U.S. Army, the factors of "character and personality, rather than his racial background, determined the degree of his acceptance by Occidentals." In these and other articles in this important document the role of culture patterns is seen to be highly significant in race relations.

E.S.B.

ARAUCANIAN CHILD LIFE AND ITS CULTURAL BACKGROUND.

By Sister M. Inez Hilger. Washington, D.C.: The Smithsonian Institution, 1957, pp. xx+439.

In the Foreword, M. W. Sterling, director of the Bureau of American Ethnology of the Smithsonian Institution, praises this descriptive study of social life and customs, and states that the recording of the personal behavior and experiences of the Araucanians (who object to being called Indian and protest the appellation of primitives when applied to them) gives "to the narrative an intimacy that not only makes it entertaining reading but imparts a human quality which adds to its value as a sociological and psychological document." Director Sterling adds that, although the Araucanians have had contacts with European civilization for four centuries, they "have retained their identity, their language, and a great deal of their aboriginal culture."

The author in the Preface points out how in this detailed study of the development and training of the Araucanian child, a larger field has been encompassed, namely, the throwing of light on the customs and beliefs of these interesting peoples in Chile and Argentina. The data were gathered, mainly, by "observation and interviewing informants in their own environment," after rapport was cautiously established with "a proud, sensitive, and intelligent people."

The book is divided into two parts, one dealing with the Araucanians of Chile and the other with the Araucanians of Argentina. The latter, having had more contacts with Argentine Government than the former have had with the Chilean Government, "are decidedly more acculturated." The impact of the Argentine Government on the Araucanians under its jurisdiction has resulted in changes "similar to those inflicted on the American Indian through subjugation by the American Government and the Indian's contact with Whites within our own recent history." The Araucanians in Argentina number perhaps 90,000, and those in Chile, several thousand more, although exact figures are not available.

Both parts of the book follow the same plan, that is, the giving of detailed facts about the impact of Araucanian customs and beliefs on the development of their children. Objectivity is maintained throughout both parts. Interpretations are carefully guarded and conclusions in the main are avoided. An extensive bibliography is included. The volume contains a wealth of social facts which are available for comparison with similar studies of other underdeveloped peoples and for sociological analyses.

E.S.B.

DOCTOR AND PATIENT IN SOVIET RUSSIA. By Mark G. Field. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1957, pp. xxii+266.

This study throws considerable light on the functions of regimented medical service as a controlled element in the Soviet system. The nature of a medical bureaucracy as described in this volume makes possible a comparison with the functions of the medical profession in a democratic country. In Russia, the Soviet authorities determine who can enter the medical profession, what standards are to be maintained, and the full range of the duties of physicians. Probably nothing is more important than the physician-patient relationships; yet in this area there is characteristically considerable arbitrary interference by the Ministry of Health, the Communist Party, industrial management, or the Secret Police.

The medical service in Soviet society is a directed and mobilized system, controlled to ensure that the physician and the health organs will not weaken the goals of the regime.

Because of the bureaucratization which prevails, the physician's work has become one of the adjustive mechanisms that keep the social system going by reducing discontent, tension, and disaffection. The principle of state-financed medical service has been generally accepted, though the methods of implementing the principle are criticized. The Soviet regime has given relatively less attention to health and medical service than to economic production, collective methods in agriculture, militarization, and other totalitarian interests.

J.E.N.

AN AFRICAN SURVEY REVISED 1956. A Study of Problems Arising in Africa South of the Sahara. By Lord Hailey. New York: Oxford University Press, 1957, pp. xxvi+1676.

The first edition of this book was published in 1938 and the present edition is described as "largely a new work." The data have been brought up to the end of 1955 and in some cases materials for 1956 are included.

The organization of the book is unusually comprehensive. It contains twenty-six chapters which include subjects such as the physical background, the land, the African peoples, the African languages, population records, health, political and social objectives, the non-European immigrant communities, the systems and administration of African affairs, law and justice, education and cultural agencies, the problems of labor, cooperative institutions, the organization of research. On these and related topics the book gives a great deal of information, and the total result is a kind of encyclopedic handbook dealing with the social, economic, political, legal developments in all the areas south of the Sahara.

In discussing *apartheid*, in the Union of South Africa, the author

presents both sides without necessarily taking sides. He says that both of the opposing sets of opinions "realize that the essence of the matter lies in the fact that the doctrine of *apartheid* implies that the European community must continue to hold a position of control over the non-European communities." He realizes that separatism has yet to face "the crucial question whether the economy of a modern industrialized State will permit the maintenance of a crude form of differentiation against a major part of the manpower on which it is dependent." A possible solution of the impasse through a form of gradual integration—economic, political, educational—is not discussed.

An interesting chapter appears on the subject of cooperative institutions wherein it is stated that "the end of cooperation is social though the means used are economic." It is pointed out that producer and marketing cooperatives exert a stronger influence on their members than do other kinds with the possible exception of cooperative credit societies. Since indigenous African society is largely in a state of subsistence economy and since "the spirit of self-help and individual initiative" is less characteristic there than of Western civilization, the development of cooperatives has come to a large extent through the "initiative and support" of governments. A lack of space forbids further references to topics discussed in this valuable tome.

E.S.B.

SOCIAL THEORY AND RESEARCH

THE GROWTH OF A SCIENCE. A Half-Century of Rural Sociological Research in the United States. By Edmund deS. Brunner. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957, pp. x+171.

In this terse book, the well-known author, who is currently chairman of the Board of Governors, Bureau of Applied Research, Columbia University, succinctly examines a wealth of material taken from available rural sociological research since 1905. After devoting the introductory chapter to historical background, this compact volume proceeds on a topical basis, utilizing chronology only where significant. General areas covered are community studies, population, social institutions, rural sociological organization, sociological aspects of economic problems, regionalism, suburbanism, trends, and values. Specialists in related fields will be impressed by the tremendous strides that have been made by the rural sociologists in the development of methodology and by their breadth of interest and research.

The author benignly does not criticize early community studies in the light of the development of methods of research since they were done. On the other hand, the book would have made an even more important contribution had the author more critically evaluated the later studies cited.

Space limitations prevented the inclusion of studies made by American rural sociologists in other countries. However, a number of such studies have added to the understanding of social life the world over. Included is an appendix that presents an annotated bibliography of studies in the Americas, Asia, and the Middle East.

This book renders a laudable service, not only to rural sociology but to all related fields. Deducing from the studies cited, it appears that there are still many states, including those on the Pacific Coast and in the Southwest, where there are wide-open opportunities for sociological research.

I. ROGER YOSHINO

State College of Washington

THE SOCIAL ORDER. AN INTRODUCTION TO SOCIOLOGY. By Robert Bierstedt. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1957, pp. 577.

This introduction to sociology presents, in general, the elements which have become traditional for such a course, in so far as it notes the natural conditions of human society, the importance of culture in sociology as a discipline, social organization, elementary forms of social differentiation, and the problem of social change. The treatment of each topic is interesting, but there seems to be a lack of depth in the development of important concepts, and the range of sociology is sometimes suggested instead of being developed objectively.

Social institutions, for instance, are given scant treatment. A frame of reference for institutions is supplied by discussing political institutions with some detail, with the implication that the student can shift for himself in the study of other institutions. Moreover, it is debatable procedure to create institutions out of various concepts or social groupings by utilizing the article *the*, e.g., *a* family is a social group, *the* family is a social institution. There are many sociologists whose conceptions of folkways, customs, mores, and institutions would find the development in this text inconsistent and possibly confusing. Some instructors may like this text because it has interesting aspects, while others will be concerned about things that are lacking for a general introduction to sociology.

J.E.N.

LABOR IN A GROWING ECONOMY. By Melvin W. Reder. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1957, pp. xii+534.

Stanford University's Professor Reder here offers a precise book consisting of what he calls an amalgam of discussions on unions and labor relations, and on wages and wage theory, income distribution, and labor mobility. He has written it for a one-semester undergraduate course in labor economics or business administration. As such, it is especially good for its more than marked clarity in the definitions of its subject matter and in its simple, straightforward presentations of materials. The organization of the book is well founded, beginning with an emphasis on the meaning and significance of the term *labor* and then proceeding to a historical analysis of American unionism—its purpose, philosophy, and politics. Collective bargaining considered as a process and in its subject matter is well and deftly handled. The third portion of the book, which the author states was the most difficult to write, reveals a successful attempt to wed theory and practical descriptive materials on the subjects of employment, wages, and income. In his final chapter, Reder concludes that "unions in the United States have cooperated with 'middle class' reformers who have espoused political and economic reforms that have benefitted the wage-earners," and that by their political efforts "have contributed to raising the incomes of wage-earners," but "the precise contribution of unions to these legislative developments will never be known." Altogether, this is a text well designed for easy comprehension of the role of labor in the United States.

M.J.V.

THE FUNCTIONS OF SOCIAL CONFLICT. By Lewis A. Coser. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1956, pp. 188.

Using Simmel's classic essay on *Conflict* as his point of departure, Coser has undertaken the threefold task of (1) clarifying the concept of social conflict, (2) correcting the current disregard by sociologists of the positive functions of social conflict, and (3) elaborating a logically consistent set of propositions which state the "various conditions under which social conflict may contribute to the maintenance, adjustment or adaptation of social relationships and social structures" (p. 151). Such a project is an ambitious one and one beset with difficulties, since Simmel's contribution to sociology rests, not in his methodological acumen nor in his systematic use of empirical knowledge, but rather in the speculative insights that are interspersed throughout his works.

It is precisely this nonsystematic character of Simmel's writing that proves to be the greatest stumbling block for Coser in his attempted synthesis; for, while he recognizes the great need for clarifying the concept of conflict, clarification is never achieved. At no point in his book does Coser present a coherent statement specifying precisely what is meant by the term *conflict*. The distinction that he draws between hostile attitudes and conflict behavior does constitute an effort in this direction. So does his attempt to distinguish unrealistic conflict, which has the psychological goal of the release of aggressive tension, from realistic conflict which in emotionally neutral fashion is directed toward ends viewed by participants as "legitimate," ends which involve conflicting claims to unequally distributed social rights and privileges.

While these distinctions are helpful, they nevertheless fail to stipulate for the reader, and apparently for the author as well, the particular properties which define whether a given form of interaction is or is not to be categorized as conflictual. Thus, it is not surprising to find that Coser indiscriminately applies the term *conflict* to such widely diverse phenomena as class struggle, war, marital bickering, racial and religious discrimination, political opposition, and social distance.

This ambiguous usage of the term *conflict* leads to a second major limitation, namely, the insertion of logically contradictory statements into the text. For instance, by defining conflict in terms of reciprocal patterns of social rejection, the author can argue that conflicts between Indian castes have the function of maintaining the stability of that system, while a few pages later, by restricting the meaning of conflict to the occurrence of overtly antagonistic actions, he can now conclude that intercaste conflict was rare in the classical Indian caste system. Such logical contradictions reduce, if they do not vitiate, the significance of Coser's analysis. A further weakness in the analysis results from the author's tendency to select two or three facts which one-sidedly support the point that is being demonstrated—particularly, when a quotation from Merton or Parsons is apparently considered just as much an empirical fact as an experimental observation by Festinger.

Although the book falls short of its stated goals, it is not without value. The author has defined a relevant problem and at times displays keen understanding of the nature of social conflict and its social implications. Consequently, it does constitute an important reference for students of social structure.

ROBERT A. ELLIS
Stanford University

PHILOSOPHY, POLITICS AND SOCIETY. Edited by Peter Laslett. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1956, pp. xvi+184.

The ten essays, by different authors, which make up this collection are valuable contemporary contributions to political and social philosophy. The subjects considered include political education, political principles, natural rights, sovereignty, punishment, the general will, Plato's political analogies, morality, and the controversy concerning the word *law*. The editor's essay, "The Face to Face Society," concludes the volume. These essays are interesting and challenging in their analysis of basic social concepts and show that political philosophy continues to have important functions in promoting our understanding of society. J.E.N.

SOME APPLICATIONS OF BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH. Edited by Rensis Likert and Samuel P. Hayes, Jr. Paris: Unesco, 1957, pp. 333.

Now that the physical sciences have been so successful in solving problems of atomic power and space travel, it is natural to ask whether the social sciences cannot be similarly put to work on the world's pressing problems of social organization. To this end, the Foundation for Research on Human Behavior has sponsored a series of seminars on social research in administrative settings. These conferences have brought together some of the leaders in applied social science in the United States to report on what they have learned from their experience in conducting this kind of research. Unesco has now published the proceedings of the seminars in the hope that methods similar to those used in the American studies can be successfully applied in other parts of the world.

Sections of the book deal with the use of sample surveys to provide information on which to base policy decisions, factors associated with effective supervisory leadership and with scientific performance of research engineers, the effect on foreign students of study in the United States, and the influence of reference groups on economic and political behavior. The latter section will be of particular interest to sociologists because of its concise statement of reference group theory and its summary of research findings.

The authors have written in a style that is both easy and profitable to read. Well-chosen (but poorly captioned) graphs and helpful annotated bibliographies supplement the text.

BRUCE M. PRINGLE

Southern Methodist University

SCIENTIFIC CAREERS AND VOCATIONAL DEVELOPMENTAL THEORY. By Donald E. Super and Paul B. Bachrach. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1957, pp. ix+135.

The preface of this monograph states that it "attempts to summarize what research has shown to be the characteristics of natural scientists, mathematicians, and engineers." In the present emergency quest for these potential scientists, the offerings of the monograph should prove to be worth while, presenting the fruits of a study designed to review, analyze, and synthesize previously published theories and researches on the subject of scientific careers. The first chapter deals with what is already known and what needs to be known about these careers. One conclusion reached from the examination of the known is that it appears doubtful "whether studies of heterogeneous samples of natural scientists, mathematicians, or engineers can yield maximally useful research results." Therefore, it is suggested that the "interaction of personal and environmental factors" be made a focal point in future research, a conclusion already reached by nearly all those interested in studies on leadership. Appraisals of the trait-and-factor theory, social-systems theory, and personality theory are given, and the means for the construction of an integrated approach leading to the formulation of a vocational developmental theory are offered. The monograph is in itself an excellent portrayal of the technique of properly pursuing a scientific inquiry.

M.J.V.

THE FABRIC OF SOCIETY. By Ralph Ross and Ernest van den Haag. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1957, pp. xvi+777.

The interdisciplinary nature of this textbook is indicated by the fact that its materials have been drawn principally from psychology, sociology, politics, and economics. The main divisions in its organization are: persons, groups, and culture; science and symbols; economic aspects of society; and the organization of (political) power. One might think, at first glance, that the first part is primarily of sociological interest, but such a limitation would be too narrow, for much of the content in the other sections is definitely of value to sociologists, for example, empirical methods of science, morals and values, religion, capitalist and collectivist ideologies, population, war and peace, democracy, party organization, and other subjects.

The book is for the most part a straight text, though not a few selections from the works of other authors have been introduced at various

points and commented upon for further development. This text is mature and ambitious in its level of coverage, though scarcely within the ability of lower division students for introductory work in related social sciences. This remark is not meant as a negative evaluation of the book—this reviewer favors books that offer students a real challenge; far too many have been “written down” within the realm of mediocrity. For the better or more advanced students this text should be a strong competitor where interdisciplinary purposes are intended. Both authors and publishers have produced a book of superior quality. J.E.N.

OTHER PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

ECONOMICS OF ATOMIC ENERGY. By Mary Goldring. New York: Philosophical Library, 1957, pp. 179.

The setting of this book is in Britain; it deals with her atomic factories, the costs of atomic power, the scale of investment that is needed, the relations of atomic energy to industry, and to Britain's atomic future. In Britain, it is stated that “atomic energy never became the political football that it was in the U.S.A.,” because only a few people were on the inside, “and they kept silent.”

THOUGHT PATTERNS. Edited by Arpad F. Kovacs. New York: St. John's University, 1957, Vol. V, pp. 100.

Includes interesting essays on topics such as “The Balance of Power,” “The Fifth Amendment,” and “The Role of Philosophy in Politics.”

IN SEARCH OF REALITY. By Viscount Samuel. New York: Philosophical Library, 1957, pp. 229.

In his search for reality, the author finds that realism is “not to be identified with materialism,” not necessarily in philosophical abstractions, but primarily in “the work of individual persons” and in the process of “conscious evolution.”

COOPERATIVE FRUIT GROWERS' ASSOCIATIONS IN WASHINGTON. By Laszlo Valko. Pullman: State College of Washington, 316, October 1957, pp. 16.

A large number of important facts are presented in this bulletin concerning thirty-seven of the local cooperative fruit growers' associations of Washington.

- A TESTAMENT OF FAITH.** By G. Bromley Oxnam. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1958, pp. 176.

In this statement of religious faith an eminent church leader speaks from the standpoint of one who regularly participates in everyday living and who knows in firsthand ways the problems of people both at home and abroad, and who appreciates the basic needs of human personality.

- THE NEUROSES AND THEIR TREATMENT.** Edited by Edward Podolsky and others. New York: Philosophical Library, 1958, pp. 555.

This book contains forty selected papers dealing with a wide variety of aspects of neuroses from a number of different viewpoints and suggesting kinds of treatment and casting light on the nature of personality when suffering from one kind of strain or another.

- KHRUSHCHEV OF THE UKRAINE. A Biography.** By Victor Alexandrov. New York: Philosophical Library, 1957, pp. 216.

A descriptive account of Khrushchev as a youth and of his methods in reaching a position of leadership.

- THE RELIGIOUS KIBBUTZ MOVEMENT.** The Revival of the Jewish Religious Community. Compiled and edited by Aryei Fishman. Jerusalem, 1957, pp. 195.

This book describes the nature and the contributions of the religious *kibbutz*, a communitarian type of group, to current life in Israel.

- ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH CENTER,** 1955-56. University of Puerto Rico, 1956, pp. 36.

- THE FEELING OF SUPERIORITY AND ANXIETY-SUPERIOR.** The Ottawa Trial Survey on Personality. By E. L. Remits, Ottawa, Canada: The Runge Press, 1957, pp. 82.

- THE CHRONICALLY ILL.** By Joseph Fox. New York: Philosophical Library, 1957, pp. 229.

Sociology and Social Research

AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL



Articles in Forthcoming Issues . . .

May-June and later

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Teaching Sociology by Television | THOMAS F. HOULT |
| Military Sociologist in Research | CHARLES H. COATES |
| Social Class in Philadelphia Methodism | F. A. SHIPPY |
| Art and Communication | BRUCE A. WATSON |
| Personal and Family Attitudes | V. CHRISTOFFERSON AND J. WALTERS |
| Social Work and Sociology | JOSEPH W. EATON |
| Intermarriage in West Africa | H. H. SMYTHE |
| Power Structure of a Community | E. V. SCHNEIDER |
| Barriers to Travel Understanding | WOODROW WHITTEN |
| American Culture Themes | PAUL MEADOWS AND W. TORRENCE |
| Anomie and Religious Orthodoxy | THOMAS C. KEEDY, JR. |
| Research Areas in Social Disorganization | ROBERT E. L. FARIS |
| Research Areas in Social Stratification | BERNARD BARBER |
| Research Areas in Demography | PHILIP M. HAUSER |
| Research Areas in International Sociology | ARNOLD M. ROSE |
| The Concept of the Group | MARIE L. BORGATTA |
| Mobility in Honolulu | ROBERT C. SCHMITT |
| Current Social Trends | FRANK T. CARLTON |
| Age as a Prestige Factor | J. S. ROUCEK |
| Marriage Role Opinions | CHARLES W. HOBART |

Articles in Preceding Issue . . .

January-February 1958

| | |
|---------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Social Disorganization | STUART A. QUEEN |
| American Sociology in the Middle East | LINCOLN ARMSTRONG |
| Northern and Southern Race Relations | FRANK F. LEE |
| Employee Training and Morale | M. J. VINCENT AND T. C. KEEDY, JR. |
| Demography and Conforming Behavior | RAYMOND G. HUNT AND ASSOCIATES |
| Current Research on the Negro | H. SMYTHE AND L. CHASE |
| Job Attitudes and Children | WILLIAM G. DYER |
| Integration as a Current Concept | EMORY S. BOGARDUS |

THE INSTITUTIONS OF SOCIETY

by JAMES K. FEIBLEMAN, Tulane University. A text and reference for advanced courses in sociology, this book presents a final chapter dealing with the social control of institutions for both theoretical and practical purposes.

The book is organized into seven major sections: *From Individuals to Institutions, From Social Groups to Institutions, From Artifacts to Institutions, The Analysis of Institutions, Types of Institutions, From Institutions to Cultures, and Institutional Limits.*

1957.

400 pages

\$8.50

The Macmillan Company

60 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK 11, N.Y.

New Ronald Books

INTRODUCTORY SOCIOLOGY

Paul H. Landis, *State College of Washington*. March 14. This new basic textbook is a concise discussion of culture, society, social structure, the individual as a social being, the processes of social control, and social institutions. It presents an unusually comprehensive discussion of the factors of religion, sex, age, occupational

statuses, and racial segregation. The case material is brief and well integrated with the lucid text. Many illustrations provide necessary data and point up basic sociological principles. Contains reading lists, discussion and review questions, film lists.

158 ills., tables; 800 pp.

LEISURE and RECREATION

A Study of Leisure and Recreation in Their Sociological Aspects

Martin H. Neumeyer, *University of Southern California*; and Esther S. Neumeyer, *Los Angeles City Schools*. Third Edition. This important new book offers the most up-to-date and comprehensive treatment of the place of leisure and recreation in modern society, summarizing and interpreting materials drawn from a wide

range of sources. It points out present-day needs and problems, analyzes the factors involved in leisure and recreational activities, and emphasizes the importance of social relations and processes. The book also discusses the recreation movement, community and commercial recreation, recreation leadership, etc.

475 pp.

THE RONALD PRESS COMPANY

15 East 26th Street, New York 10, N.Y.